DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 948 PS 008 982

AUTHOR	Dopyera, John; Lay, Margaret
TITLE	Assessing the Program Environments of Head Start and Other Pre-School Children: A Survey of Procedures. Addendum to Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ., N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 69
CONTRACT	OEO-4120
NOTE	202p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility of original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Check Lists; Classroom Environment; *Classroom Observation Techniques; *Early Childhood Education; *Evaluation Methods; Preschool Children; *Preschool Programs; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Rating Scales; Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The objective of this undertaking has been to identify procedures and perspectives which have potential for assessing program environments of preschool age children, analyze the procedures relative to program components abstracted from known preschool programs, and discuss the results of this analysis in terms of its relevance for future program environment assessment. More specifically, the work described in this report consisted of completing the following tasks: (1) searching and identifying materials, i.e. program documentation procedures, written descriptions of programs, other materials on environments which might be useful; (2) analyzing the procedures for methodological and substantive similarities and differences and developing a perspective on assessment; (3) analyzing programs for their components and the development of a criterion list of program components - as well as elaboration of the concept of program environment; (4) cross-comparison of the procedures with the criterion list for determining the program documentation capacity of existent procedures; (5) examining the results of this work in terms of implications for program assessment and for future development of procedures for program assessment. Many of the rating forms and scales discussed are included in the appendices. (Author/MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131948

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ASSESSING THE PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTS
of
HEAD START AND OTHER PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN

A SURVEY OF PROCEDURES

John Dopyera
Syracuse University
Head Start Evaluation Project

and

Margaret Lay
Syracuse University
School of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Addendum to
Final Report

PS 008982

The research reported herein was conducted pursuant to a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, Contract No. OEO-4120 and the Evaluation and Research Center, Project Head Start, Syracuse University, William J. Meyer, Director.

August 1969

Table of Contents

Introduction
- Background and Task
- Scope and Organization

Procedures, Programs, and Cross-Comparisons
- Identification and Methodological Analysis of Program Assessment Procedures
- Identification and Compilation of Sources of Program Variation
- Results of Cross-Comparisons of Program Variation Lists and Procedures for Assessing Programs

Discussion of Findings and Issues
- Practical Considerations
- Metric Considerations
- Design and Conceptualization Issues

Summary and Recommendations

References

Appendix: Procedure Descriptions
- APPROACH: A Procedure for Patterning Responses of Adults and Children (APPRO)
- Behavior-Sanction-Interaction (B-S-I)
- Characteristics of Teaching Staff (CH-TS)
- Checklist of Administrative Variables (CH-AD.V)
- Center Facilities and Resources Inventory (Cen FRI)
- Class Facilities and Resources Inventory (CF RI)
- Classroom Behavior Form (CRB)

Table of Contents Continued

Class Room Observation Form (C.O.F.)
Class Room Register (Cl Reg)
Cognitive Stimulation Coding Categories (CSCC)
Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior (D-B Beh)
Integrated Individual Observation Schedule (IIOS)
Location Activity Material Inventory (LAMI)
Medical/Dental Information (Med-Den)
Mueller
Observation of Substantive Curricular Input (OSCI)
Observer Rating Form (ORF)
Parent Participation Record: Class (PPR-CL)
Parent Participation Record: Center (PPR-Ct)
Pedersen
Personal Record of School Experience (PROSE)
Post Observation Teacher Rating Scale (P.O.T.)
Post Program Interview with Teacher (PPIWT)
Praise Blame Observation (Pr-Bl)
Preschool Environment Inventory (PEI)
School Environment Measure (SEM)
Sher
Social Interaction Observation Schedule (SIOS)
Spaulding Teacher Activity Rating Schedule (STARS)
Staff-Member Information (S.Info)
Teacher Behavior Survey Instrument (TBSI)
Teacher Observation Schedule (TOS)
Teacher Play Period Rating (TPPR)

List of Tables

Table I: Procedures

Table II: Programs

Table III: Cross-Comparisons

Introduction

Background and Task

The genesis of this survey goes back to the spring of 1968 when the senior author participated in the O.E.O. Head Start program evaluation task force consisting of representatives from several of the twelve universities then involved in the National Head Start Evaluation and Research undertaking. The purpose of the task force was to assist in continued planning, including selection of procedures, for the subsequent years' National Head Start evaluation. It soon became clear that such a committee, operating informally, could not spend sufficient time to undertake adequate searching and screening of procedures pertinent to their task, and thus, during the late spring and summer of 1968 three of the universities were funded to pursue the task of identifying and recommending procedures for general use.

Each of the universities funded was to focus on assessment procedures in a particular area: Bank Street, cognitive; Michigan State, social-emotional and family; Syracuse University, program evaluation. The specific tasks for each task force were to be (1) an exhaustive search for potentially useful procedures, (2) the selection of the more promising for field-testing, (3) the field-testing of those selected as having high potential usefulness, (4) the recommendation of procedures for inclusion in future national evaluations.

The need for such an undertaking in regard to program evaluation was painfully evident. It was becoming clear that is was erroneous to assume that the content of program guides, curriculum descriptions, (including those of Head Start), were implemented in any systematic way. Thus, the meaning of comparisons between Head Start vs. Non-Head Start groups, Head Start a la Bank Street vs. Head Start a la Sullivan, etc. were unclear without means of assessing what was happening to and for kids in a given program

Several literature surveys which had been previously funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, Head Start, for the purpose of identifying readily accessible documentation procedures had not addressed the program area (Johnson, no date; Hess, 1966; Cassileth, 1966).

In addition, the procedures developed within the Head Start network were either having metric difficulties or were impractical because of the length of time required to process and analyze them. It was also becoming clear that procedures designed for strictly an evaluation function (e.g. Are program guidelines being met?), were not necessarily useful for research questions.

A shift in policy during the fall of 1968 brought about an unexpected twist to this survey. At that time a policy decision appears to have been made within O.E.O to discontinue the National Head Start Evaluation and Research effort. The universities participating the Head Start Evaluation and Research network were informed that no 1969-70 national evaluation would occur.

Although the national program has subsequently been reactivated,redefined and redirected, in the form of five Head Start Research and Development centers, the implications of the policy decision were essentially to obviate the goal of the original undertaking - i.e. recommendation of procedures to be used. In addition, with the shift in emphasis, feedback from Washington regarding criteria for evaluating procedures and the selection of procedures on which to focus field testing was discontinued. Eventually, by mutual agreement, field-testing of procedures was eliminated from the definition of responsibility for the Syracuse task.

The redefinition of the contract did not, however, obviate the problem of how to conceptualize and assess programs to determine the extent to which they are (1) similar and/or different from each other, and (2) influential in inducing desired changes in child participants.

Thus, though the field testing portion of the initial assignment was eliminated, the search and analysis phases were well underway, and as the results would be of general interest to early childhood educators and evaluators, the survey was continued and completed to its present form.

Scope and Organization

The work described in this report thus consisted of completing the following five tasks:

(1) Searching and identifying materials, i.e. program documentation procedures, written descriptions of programs, other materials on environments which might be useful;

(2) analyzing the procedures for methodological and substantive similarities and differences and developing a perspective on assessment;

(3) analyzing programs for their components and the development of a criterion list of program components - as well as elaboration of the concept of program environment;

(4) cross-comparison of the procedures with the criterion list for determining the program documentation capacity of existent procedures;

(5) examining the results of this work in terms of its implications for program assessment and for future development of procedures for program assessment.

In summary, the objective of this undertaking has been to identify procedures and perspectives which have potential for assessing program environments of preschool age children, analyze the procedures relative to program components abstracted from known preschool programs, and discuss the results of this analysis in terms of its relevance for future program environment assessment.

Although the total survey had a much broader scope than what is included in this report, only those procedures and/or the aspects of procedures which seemed the most appropriate were included for detailed consideration. It may be useful, therefore, to specify what this report does not include. First, it doesn't include reference to a large number of procedures which, while properly within the domain of program environment assessors, are either less pertinent to preschool, or are described elsewhere in detail. For example, the many derivatives of Flander's Interaction Analysis, in their present form do not pertain directly to preschool settings, and are also thoroughly described in Simon and

Boyer (1967) Mirror for Behavior. Other systems for examining classroom environments, such as Withalls (1951) Classroom Climate and Medley and Mitzel's (1963) OSCAR are detailed in the Gage (1963) Handbook of Research on Teaching and are thus not included here.

Several general approaches and strategies are also not reviewed as they are contained in the Wright chapter of the Mussen (1960) Handbook of Child Development Research. In addition, while the notion of program environment as outlined in this report could pertain to virtually any setting, procedures developed for documenting settings other than those generally thought of as "formal education" are not reviewed here. This thus excludes the various procedures for documenting family settings, community settings, as well as the various procedures developed for specific research purposes in clinical settings (e.g. doll play, etc.)

In addition, while many perspectives and procedures from a variety of disciplines were identified as having potential relevance to the task of documenting program environments of preschool age children, unless these approaches had undergone specific translation into the preschool setting (e.g. the idea in Behavior Modification of base-rate counting is the basis of the SIOS procedure included in this report) they have not been included. Examples of some perspectives reviewed but not reported upon that might have relevance for future work are: Stern's (1963) self-report Environment Characteristics Indices, Geer (1964) and Coleman (1961) on participant observation, Halpin (1963) with the OCDQ, Gump (1967, 1968), Schoggen and Schoggen (1968) and Barker (1963) with Psychological Ecology, and Mort (1944) with his Guide for the Analysis and Description of Public School Services.

This report also does not include much information on the research and/or evaluation of the procedures reviewed. Many of the procedures located were in developmental form and evidence was lacking. In some instances some analyses have been undertaken but were not as yet written up or for some other reason were inaccessible. Where reliability and/or validity evidence was readily available it was noted but no great effort was expended to track it down.

No attempt was made to independently collect various quality control and/or other program component documentation procedures developed this year within the Evaluation and Research Network. It was assumed that these procedures were adequately reviewed and synthesized within the Post Program Interview with Teachers developed by the O.E.O. Head Start Central Office Staff and reviewed within that report. Finally, materials not identified by March of this year (1969) are not included in this report.

There is need for clarification of the conceptual referents of the two terms, "assessment" and "program environment," employed by the writers in the process of formulating, conducting and describing this project. Since the use of these terms may to some extent reflect a particular bias it is important that this position be made explicit for the reorder.

The term assessment, as used in this report, means to observe a given event, to record that event via some descriptive procedure, and then to analyze those descriptions to determine the differential components or characteristics of that event.

In the phrase program environment the joint usage of "program" with "environment" was employed to present a heretofore neutral concept allowing the inclusion of (1) physical presence of facets surrounding behavior and (2) the broader social and organizational structure which supports both these facets and the behavior while excluding from this consideration the behavior itself. Environment can be anything which is external to a given subject, which may include the behavior of other subjects. In this report any of the following have been considered as potential facets of a program environment:

(1) any collection of elements contrived to solve a problem, whether or not those elements or the problem is specified.

(2) any explicit/overt set of "outputs" into the situation when those outputs may potentially be experienced by participants in that setting;

(3) a direct encounter an organism has with some facet of his immediate context (people, things, settings) within and/or across time.

As the reader continues through this report it will be noted that program assessment procedures are described for all three of the above definitions and that the content categories used, i.e., administrative, curriculum (and organization), teacher, peer composition, and physical plant and facilities are equally applicable to all three definitions of program environment.

Procedures, Programs, and Cross-Comparisons

In this section the procedures identified are classified and briefly described; the programs which served as the basis for developing a criterion list of program variation are indexed; and the results of the cross-comparison between the procedures and the criterion list are presented and discussed.

Identification and Methodological Analysis of Program Assessment Procedures

The major task was to identify existing procedures which might produce valid indicators of program parameters. An exhaustive search of the literature plus extensive telephoning produced thirty-three procedures which met the criteria of being appropriate for use in pre-school settings.

Each of these procedures was examined, and subsequently classified, relative to the following questions:

(1) What methodology was utilized?

(2) Who developed the procedure? Where was it developed?

(3) What data format was used (e.g. verbal descriptions, codes and/or tallies, rating scales, measurement)?

(4) What personnel were used to collect the date (e.g. program personnel, or non-program personnel)?

(5) What is the scope of the procedures? What components of programs are screened in via the procedure (e.g. teacher and/or aide behavior, curriculum, physical plant and/or facilities, peer composition, administration and/or other contextual factors)?

The thirty-three procedures identified for further analysis may be classified according to the dominant methodology, the first question posed above. In the schema that was developed for this classification, two dimensions of methodology were employed. The first included how the data was derived, i.e. through observations, from self-reports (including interviews and questionaire - inventories), or mixed strategies. The second was the actual data source. The following six categories were derived from these dual aspects of methodological classifications.

(1) Observation, Adult-based. An observer watches the adult (usually the teacher or an aide) and records her behavior. Although some child behavior or other aspects of the situation may be obtained, the focus is upon the adult and her behavior and/or encounters.

(2) Observation, individual child-based. An observer watches a subject child recording what happens to him (or in some cases, what the child does). Although some adult behavior or other aspects of the situation may be obtained if encountered by a target child, the focus is on the child.

(3) Observation, composite of adult-and child based. An observer watched the adult (teacher and/or aide) and child or children simultaneously or alternately, recording what happens to them and usually from which sources.

(4) Self-report, interview. An interviewer is present with a program staff member while that staff member recalls factual and/or impressionistic information about the program

(5) Self-report, questionaires. Similar data is obtained as in the above but with no interviewer present.

(6) Mixed strategies. Both observation and self-report approaches are used to develop data.

On the following pages the procedures are arranged according to the above schema. The name of the procedure, its acronym, the developer, and the scope are included. Additional brief descriptions of each of the procedures and the recording sheet (or example) are included in Appendix A.

Table I: Procedures

OBSERVATION STRATEGIES: TEACHER-BASED

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(1) Cognitive Stimulation (CSCC) Coding Categories	Berry, Hess, Shipman Chicago Institute of Early Childhool Education	Teacher (Verbal) behavior; curricular; student composition
(2) Mueller Categories for (Mueller) Coding Cognitive Demand, Prop Setting Bungles, Activity Language Bungles, Impeding Discovery	Mueller Wayne State	Teacher (verbal-non-verbal) behavior
(3) Observer Rating Form (ORF)	Pierce-Jones, Caldwell, Lynn University of Texas	Teacher behavior
(4) Post Observation Teacher Rating Scale (P.O.T.)	Dopyera, Lindstrom, Hollingshead	Teacher behavior
(5) Spaulding Teacher Activity Rating Schedule (STARS)	Spaulding Duke University	Teacher Behavior
(6) Teacher Behavior Survey Instrument (TBSI)	Katz San Francisco State	Teacher behavior: curriculum
(7) Teacher Observation Schedule (TOS)	Wilensky IDS, New York University	Teacher (verbal) behavior

OBSERVATIONS STRATEGIES: TEACHER-BASED

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(8)Teacher Play Period Rating (TPPR)	Wilensky IDS, New York University	Teacher behavior

OBSERVATION STRATEGIES: Individual Child-Based

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(1) A Procedure for Patterning (APPROACH) Responses of Adults and Children	Caldwell, Honig, Wynn Syracuse University Upstate (N.Y.) Medical Center	S behavior; teacher behavior curriculum; physical plant/facilities
(2) Behavior Sanction Inventory (B-S-I)	Dopyera Syracuse University	S behavior; teacher behavior; curriculum; physical plant/facilities; S composition
(3) Classroom Record of Behavior (CRB)	Garfunkel Boston University	S behavior;teacher behavior; peer composition;physical plant/facilities
(4). Intergrated IOS (IIOS)	Dopyera, Lindstrom, Hollingshead Syracuse University	S behavior;teacher-aide behavior; curriculum;physical plant/facilities;peer composition
(5) Location Activity Material Inventory (LAMI)	Wilensky IDS, New York University	S behavior;physical plant/facilities;peer composition
(6) Personal Record of School Experience (PROSE)	Medley, Schluck, Ames Educational Testing Service	S behavior; teacher behavior; curriculum;physical plant/facilities;peer composition

OBSERVATION STRATEGIES: Individual Child-Based

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(7) Social Interaction Observation schedule (SIOS)	Etzel, Tyler, *et. al.*	S behavior;teacher behavior; peer composition

OBSERVATION STRATEGIES: Composite Teacher and Children-Based

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(1) Classroom Observation Form (C.O.F.)	Educational Testing Service	S behavior;teacher behavior; curriculum
(2) Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior	Anderson	Teacher behavior; S behavior
(3) Observation of Substantive Curricular Input (OSCI)	Stern, Raymer, Litwin, et.al. University of California, Los Angeles	Ss behavior;teacher behavior curriculum;physical plant/ facilities
(4) Praise - Blame(Pr-Bl)	Meyer, Lindstrom Lindstrom University	S (verbal) behavior;teacher (verbal) behavior;curriculum
(5) Preschool Environment Inventory (PEI)	Stern Bank Street College of Education	Teacher behavior;physical plant/facilities;curriculum
(6) No Name	Pedersen, Fox National Institutes of Child Health and Development	S behavior;teacher behavior; curriculum

SELF-REPORT STRATEGIES: Interviews

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(1) Characteristics of Teaching Staff (Ch-TS)	Stern, et.al. University of California, Los Angeles	Teacher/Aide demographic characteristics
(2) Checklist of Administrative Variables (Ch-AD.V.)	Jones, et.al. Tulane University	Administrative organization
(3) Post-Program Interview With Teacher (PPIWT)	O.E.O., Head Start	Curriculum;physical plant/ facilities; administration

SELF-REPORT STRATEGIES: Questionaires and Inventories

Procedures	Developer	Scope
(1) Center Facilities and Resources Inventory (Cen FRI)	O.E.O. Head Start	Staff behavior;composition; physical plant/facilities
(2) Classroom Register (Cl Reg)	O.E.O, Head Start	Composition - identification
(3) Medical - Dental Forms (Med-Den)	O.E.O., Head Start	Curriculum - Medical
(4) Parent Participation Record;Class (PPR-Cl)	O.E.O., Head Start	Curriculum
(5) Parent Participation Record - Center (PPR-Ct)	O.E.O Head Start	Curriculum; demographic
(6) School Environment Measure (SEM)	Cooper, Circirelli, & Granger Westinghouse Learning Corporation	Curriculum; teaching staff; administrative staff
(7) Staff Information Form (S. Info)	O.E.O., Head Start	Staff-demographic

MIXED STRATEGIES*

Procedure	Developer	Scope
(1) Class Facilities and Resources Inventories (plus Temple list)	Stern *et.al.* University of California, Los Angeles	Physical plant and facilities; administrative
(2) No Name	Sher *et.al.* Columbia University	S behavior; teacher behavior; curriculum; physical plant/ facilites; peer composition administrative

Identification and Compilation of Sources of Program Variation

Since the task of this survey as it was redefined was to determine the extent to which existent procedures assessed parameters of preschool programs, it was deemed necessary to determine how programs are presumed to vary. As no comprehensive listing of program parameters could be located one was generated for the purpose of this study.

Three approaches were used to determine aspects of program considered of importance by professionals in early childhood education: (1) descriptions of prototypic and experimental programs were obtained and analyzed; (2) visits were made to many preschool programs to determine in which respects programs actually do vary from each other in observable ways: (3) experienced teachers were asked to reflect on the programs they had had contact with to obtain their perceptions of the significant ways in which programs might be characterized.

The overwhelming conclusion of the first effort of reading and analyzing program descriptions was that reporters of programs generally give insufficient detail about those programs and settings. Comparisons of these documents did reveal many variations between programs, however, despite the scarcity of description. The program descriptions utilized in this phase are summarized in Table II.

Table II: Programs

SPECIFIC PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

NAME	AGE GROUP	REFERENCES
Academically Oriented Preschool	4-5	Bereiter and Engleman, 1966 Bereiter, 1967 Bereiter and Engleman, 1968 Engleman, 1968
Children's Center	6 mo. - 5 yr.	Caldwell and Richmond, 1964 Caldwell, 1967 Caldwell, 1967
Cornell Story Reading	1½-2½	Macklin, no date
DARCEE Early Training	3-5	Gray et al., 1966 Horton, no date Klaus and Gray, 1968 The Picture Story of DARCEE, 1967
Diagnostically-Based	5	Spicker et al., 1966 Stearns et al., 1966
eip	Infancy-El.Sch.	eip: The Durham Education Improvement Program - 1966-1967 Spaulding, 1968
Eliot-Pearson	3-5	The Eliot-Pearson Children's School, no date
Florida Parent Education Project	Infancy	Gordon, 1967 Gordon and Lally, 1967
Georgia Stimulation Program	3-12 (long.)	Findley, 1968 Johnson, 1966 Johnson, 1967

Institute for Developmental Studies	3-5	Deutsch, 1967 Feldman, 1966 Powledge, 1967 The Deutsch Model - ERIC document, no date
Learning to Learn-Sprigle	4-5	Sprigle et al., 1967 Van de Riet et al., 1966
Montessori	3-5	Kohlberg, 1968 Montessori, 1964 Oren, 1965 Rambusch, 1962 Wolf, no date
N.Y. State Pre-K	3-4	Sackett and Feldman, no date Description of Pre-kindergarten Program, no date Pre-Kindergarten Program, no date
Perry Pre-School	3-4	Weikart et al., 1964 Weikart, 1967

GENERAL PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

CATEGORY	REFERENCES
Early programs - diverse	Frazier, 1968 Hamlin et al., 1967 Hooper and Marshall, 1968 MacDonald, 1969 Parent and Child Centers, OEO, 1967
Nursery School	Beyer, 1968 Hymes, 1968 McCartney, 1961 Pitcher, 1964 Head, 1966
Readings (including program discussion)	Frost, 1968 Hechinger, 1966 Hess and Bear, 1968

The observations and analysis of observations in actual preschool classes contributed additional items of differences between programs. The idea that mere presence of preschool program is sometimes considered as a unidimensional variable in evaluative studies becomes more and more ludicrous as one is faced with the number of differences existing from program to program even within one local geographical area. The kinds of programs visited included a variety of Head Start classes, a university nursery school, day care center, research-based nursery school, local pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, public school classes, Montessori classes.

Some additional items of program difference were obtained through the third effort in which associates were informally consulted and university class groups of practicing preschool teachers were polled concerning the characteristics of programs they had experienced.

The result of these efforts was the formulation of a list of ways in which professionals in early childhood education consider programs to vary from each other. The listing of possible program variation has been outlined under five broad categories: (1) administrative and contextual; (2) teacher characteristics and behavior; (3) curriculum; (4) physical environment and facilities; (5) student composition. Although it is certainly not an exhaustive list (and although changes in level at which items are phrased could serve to lengthen or abbreviate), it does provide a rather comprehensive set of items against which to compare the data which is obtained via the existent assessment procedures.

Results of Cross-Comparisons of Program Variation lists and Procedures for Assessing Programs

In order to determine the extent of which existent procedures assessed a variety of preschool programs, each procedure was examined relative to each question contained in the criterion list of program variation. The results of the analyses are contained in the tables which follow. The procedures are grouped in order by the methodology described earlier to assist the reader in interpreting the abbreviations. A check on the grid by a criterion list item indicates that the given procedure in some way addresses the item.

Table III: Cross-Comparisons

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B. Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
1. ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONTEXTUAL INPUTS																																	
A. PROGRAM GOALS																																	
1. What are the goals?																																	X
2. To what extent are the theoretical bases for these goals specified?																																	
3. To what extent are the goals/objectives precisely specified?																																	X
4. How comprehensive are the goals/objectives?																																	X
B. PURPOSES OF PROGRAMS																																	
1. To what extent is the purpose of the program investigative?																																	
2. To what extent is the purpose of the program teacher training?																																	
3. To what extent is the purpose demonstration of a program previously developed?																																	
4. To what extent is the purpose implementation of a program previously developed and demonstrated?																											X						
C. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE CONTEXT																																	
1. What budgetary system is used?																																	X
2. What publicity is obtained?																																	
3. How are students selected and placed in classrooms? Criteria?																																	X
4. What follow-up of students is conducted?																																	X

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
D. PERSONNEL	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPRT	APPRO	B-S-I	CPB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B. Beh	OSCI	Pt-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-AD.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Rec	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
1. What selection criteria are used?																						X							X				X
2. By what means are potential personnel contacted?																									X								X
3. What is the salary schedule?																																	X
4. What evaluation/retention criteria?																																	X
5. What personnel are utilized regularly and directly in the classroom?			X													X							X		X								X
a. What variation within weekly/daily time segments?																																	
b. What variation across program duration?																																	
6. What other personnel are utilized number?			X																				X		X								X
7. How are personnel deployed?			X																				X								X		X
8. To what extent are parents of children employed and/or utilized as tutors?																						X							X	X			
II. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIOR																																	
A. CHARACTERISTICS (PERVASIVE)																																	
1. Is the teacher predominantly integrative, dominative, or a flexible combination?																		X		X											X		
2. To what extent is the teacher stimulative, custodial, moderative, or a combination?					X		X													X	X												X
3. To what extent is the teacher flexible?																																	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Interview			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr.-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
4. To what extent is the teacher curious?																				X													
5. What are the teachers expectancies?			X																					X							X		X
6. Is the teacher interested in process or output, etc.?						X													X	X													X
B. INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN																																	
1. To what extent does the teacher interact with children					X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X		X	X												X
2. To what number of children is the interaction simultaneously directed?	X			X						X								X			X												X
3. To what extent do the interactions consist of eye contact, facial change, verbalization, touch, body support?				X		X				X						X				X													X
4. To what extent is the content of interaction related to an ongoing child activity or concern as compared to teacher imposed activity or concern?			X	X		X													X	X	X												
5. To what extent is the content of the interaction evaluative, instructional, safety or program maintenance directive?	X			X	X	X		X	X		X							X	X	X	X												X
6. What are the characteristics of the verbal interaction?	X	X	X		X	X	X			X		X					X		X	X	X												X
7. What were the characteristics of the child's behavior immediately prior to adult initiation of interaction?		X							X	X		X							X		X												

III. CURRICULUM (PROGRAM CONTENT/ORGANIZATION)

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B. Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl.	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch.Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Rec	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
A. TIME USAGE																																	
1. What is total amount of time utilized?																																	X
a. How long is each daily session?																																	X
b. How many days per week?																																	
c. How many weeks per year?																										X							
d. What is actual attendance?																																	
2. How does time usage vary within each day?																																	
a. How many different time units are used and how long are time units?																				X													X
b. How uniformly is a daily time pattern adhere to?				X																	X										X		X
c. To what degree do children's activities vary across differently designated time units?				X						X										X	X												X
d. What are alternatives available to children within specific time units in regard to movement, equipment etc.?				X						X			X					X			X												X
e. To what extent is time spent in differing teacher-pupil ratios?										X								X			X												X
3. To what extent does daily time use pattern with week (special events?)																																	X
4. To what extent does daily time use pattern change across total program span?																																	
B. CURRICULUM GUIDES																																	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
1. To what extent is curriculum content and sequence pre-planned and specified?			X	X																X								X			X		X
2. What is rationale of preplanning?																																	
a. Is there task analysis from simple to complex?																																	
b. Is there logical analysis into basic structure of content?																																	
c. Is there a cataloging of alternative means to achieve outcomes?																																	
d. Is any particular stage-appropriateness scheme utilized?																																	
e. Is diagnostic assessment used?																																	
f. Is planning based on presumed lacks of general population?																																	
g. To what extent does curriculum consist of activity listings according to undeterminable criteria?																																	
C. TEACHING STRATEGIES																																	
1. To what extent are strategies for developing attentional factors, discriminations, etc, utilized?	X	X	X	X								X						X		X	X			X									X
a. To what extent are references made to previous encounters of child (for comparisons with novel)?		X		X																													

45

46

	OBSERVATION																				SELF REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSSC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	Stars	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.R.	D-B. Beh	OSCI	Pr-B1	PEI	Pederson	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIUI	Cen FRI	Cl Rec	Mad-Don	PPR-C1	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SE.	CPRI	Char
b. To what extent is child asked to give guess or hunch as to probable outcome of action to be taken?		X																															
c. To what extent are children asked to make a decision concerning which of alternative actions they will take in situation where outcome of action will be observable?		X																															
d. To what extent are children asked to verbalize cues used in problem-solving situation?		X																															
2. To what extent are strategies for developing language facility used?				X							X							X		X				X									X
a. To what extent are child utterances "elaborated?"			X																	X				X									
b. To what extent is there modeling of vocabulary and sentence structure?			X																														
(1) To what extent is modeling based on child's own current activity?																				X				X									
(2) To what extent is content of modeling pre-determined according to criteria other than child's ongoing activity?																								X									

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSSC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TLSI	TOC	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B. Beh	OSCI	Fr-Bl	TEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIUT	Cen FEI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
(3) To what extent is content of modeling prepared materials story books, records, Language Master, etc.?									X	X										X				Δ									
c. To what extent direct verbal instruction in language usage and sentence patterns?	X	X	X	X								X						X		X				X									X
d. To what extent is child "bombarded" with adult verbalization?	X		X						X	X		X						X		X	X												
3. To what extent are strategies for developing "self-image" utilized?																																	
a. To what extent are children referred to by name?																					X												
b. To what extent are children's initiations responded to?			X		X	X				X		X			Δ					X	X												X
c. To what extent are children's verbal expressions recorded (taped, written?)									X																								
d. To what extent are children's work efforts preserved and displayed?																					X												
e. Other?			X																	X	X												X
4. To what extent are general strategies for cognitive structuring utilized?					X		X				X							X		X	X												X

	OBSERVATION																					SELF REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Interview			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	CSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIMT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
a. To what extent does the teacher ask for or provide category labels?	X									X										X	X												
b. To what extent does teacher make or ask for inferences?	X																			X	X												
c. Other?	X			X																X	X												
5. To what extent are management strategies utilized?					X																												
a. To what extent are reinforcers (food, tokens, verbal) systematically used for behavioral management?					X				X										X		X		X										
b. To what extent is immediacy of feedback of effect of action provided to child?							X		X												X			X									
c. Other?																					X												
D. HOME AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT																																	
1. To what extent does program include training for family members?																																	
a. Which family members are trained?																								X			X					X	
b. What is length and frequency of training sessions?																								X			X						

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CCCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-C-I	CRB	IIOS	LAHI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-S.Beh	OSCI	Pr-El	PEI	Federsen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEI	CFRI	Shar
c. What training strategies are used?																								X									
d. What is content of the training?																								X				X					
e. What are qualifications and characteristics of training personnel?																								X									
f. What are expected outcomes of the training?																																	
2. To what extent does the program include family involvement but not specific training? Kind of involvement?																								X				X	X		X		X
3. To what extent does the program provide home instruction for the child?																																	
a. What is the length and frequency of instructional sessions?																																	
b. Who instructs the child (family member, professional, non-professional)?																																	
c. What is the content of the instruction?																																	
d. What is the source of materials for instruction?																																	
e. Under what conditions is instruction provuded? Outdoors? In? Others present?																																	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOC	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-21	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PRIMI	Cen Fri	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
f. What strategies and kinds of materials are used for instruction?																								X									
IV. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND FACILITIES																																	
A. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION																																	
. What size town or city? Rural?																									X							X	
2. How far and under what conditions do children commute to school?																									X							X	
3. What weather variations are encountered? What proportion of time are rain, snow, frozen ground, etc. encountered?																																	
B. OUTDOOR AREA																																	
1. What is the total amount of outdoor space?																				X	X				X								
2. What is average ratio of space to children?																									X							X	
3. To what extent is outdoor space divided into activity areas?																																	
4. To what extent is ground surface																																	

	OBSERVATION																				SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite					Inter view.			Questionnaire								
	CSSC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	TIOS	LAHI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B. Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad. V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Don	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CPRI	Sher
asphalt, grass, sand, etc.										X											X				X							X	
5. To what extent does outdoor space have foliage? Large? Small?																					X	X			X							X	
6. To what extent is outdoor space shared by other school groups? Age? Activity?																					X												
7. To what extent is outdoor space enclosed and inaccessible to non-school groups, i.e., neighbors, dogs, etc.?																					X											X	
8. What equipment is available, i.e. sand box, climbing apparatus, movable materials?										X								X		X	X	X			X								
C. INDOOR SPACE																																	
1. What is total amount of indoor space?																	X				X					X						X	X
2. To what extent is space divided into areas/rooms?																																	X
3. What is the height of the rooms in relation to floor area?																																	
4. What are shapes of rooms?																																	X
5. What is ratio of space to number of children?																					X					X						X	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B. Beh	OsCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen Fri	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
D. ATMOSPHERIC AND ACOUSTICAL CONDITIONS																																	
1. What are lighting variations? Average?																				X	X												
2. What are heating variations? Variations?																																X	
3. What are humidity variations? Average?																																	
4. To what extent is air circulated?																				X												X	
5. To what extent does sound reverberate (presence of acoustical ceilings and walls, carpeting, curtains, etc.)?																				X	X											X	
E. EQUIPMENT IN PRIMARY INDOOR INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE																																	
1. What furniture table, benches, rockers?										X						X				X												X	X
2. To what extent is furniture/equipment scaled to child size?																																	
3. What other equipment is available (magnets, books, puppet stage, blocks, etc.)										X								X		X				X	X							X	X
4. How is equipment arranged? To what extent is equipment arranged in discernible storage areas? Perceptual clarity of storage designations?																					X												X

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	B-B. Beh	CSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Other
a. To what extent is teacher help required for children to have access to equipment?																				X													X
b. To what extent can equipment be carried and rearranged to other locations for use?										X																							X
c. To what extent is equipment arranged to encourage or discourage joint usage of several kinds of equipment simultaneously?																																/	X
F. SCHEDULING OF EQUIPMENT USAGE																																	
1. What proportion of equipment is always available?																																	
2. What equipment is introduced and removed?																																	
3. What is rationale for introduction and removal?																																	
4. What is schedule for introduction and removal?																																	
G. OTHER INDOOR FACILITIES																																	
1. What toilet facilities are utalized?																				X												X	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child						Composite							Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	Stars	TBSI	TOS	TTFR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	ILOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-B1	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PRINT	Gen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Der	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
a. To what extent are toilet facilities accessible to children without teacher intervention?																				X												X	
b. Are toilet facilities scaled to child size.																																X	
c. To what extent are they arranged to encourage conjoint usage?																																	
2. What other facilities are available for use, i.e. library, kitchen, etc.																									X							X	
3. IS an internal communications system used?																																	
V. STUDENT COMPOSITION A. CHARACTERISTICS OF GROUP																																	
1. What is total class size?										X						X									X	X							X
2. What is racial composition?																									X								X
3. What is ethnic composition?																									X								X
4. What is religious affiliation composition.																																	

	OBSERVATION																				SELF-REPORT											MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite					Inter-view			Questionnaire									
	OSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIQS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
5. What is the sex composition?																X									X								X
6. What is the socio-economic class composition?																													X				X
7. What is the age composition?																									X	X							X
B. RECRUITMENT																																	
1. How were students recruited?																																	X
C. ATTENDANCE																																	
1. What is attendance record of enrollees?																																	
2. What were attrition rates?																																	
D. PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN																																	
1. What are skill repertoires?																																	
2. What are interpersonal skills?																																	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWI	Cen FRI	Cl Rep	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
IV PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND FACILITIES																																	
A. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION																																	
1. What size town or city? Rural?																									X							X	
2. How far and under what conditions do children commute to school?																									X							X	
3. What weather variations are encountered? What proportion of time are rain, snow, frozen ground, etc. encountered?																																	
B. OUTDOOR AREA																																	
1. What is the total amount of outdoor space?																				X	X				X								
2. What is average ratio of space to children?																									X							X	
3. To what extent is outdoor space divided into activity areas?																																	
4. To what extent is ground surface asphalt, grass, sand, etc.?										X											X				X							X	
5. To what extent does outdoor space have foliage? Large? Small?																					X	X			X							X	
6. To what extent is outdoor space shared by other school groups? Age? Activity?																					X												
7. To what extent is outdoor space en closed and inaccessible to non-school groups, i.e., neighbors, dogs, etc.?																					X											X	
8. What equipment is available, i.e. sand box, climbing apparatus, movable materials?																									x								

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-E.Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-AdTW	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
C. INDOOR SPACE																																	
1. What is total amount of indoor space?																	X				X				X							X	X
2. To what extent is space divided into areas/rooms?																																	X
3. What is height of rooms in relation to floor area?																																	
4. What are shapes of rooms?																																	X
5. What is ratio of space to number of children?																					X					X						X	
D. ATMOSPHERIC AND ACOUSTICAL CONDITIONS																																	
11. What are lighting variations? Average?																				X	X											X	
2. What are heating variations? Average?																																X	
3. What are humidity variations? Average?																																	
4. To what extent is air circulated?																				X												X	
5. To what extent does sound reverberate (presence of acoustical ceilings and walls, carpeting, curtains, etc.)?																				X	X											X	
E. EQUIPMENT IN PRIMARY INDOOR INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE																																	
1. What furniture-table, benches, rockers?										X						X				X												X	X
2. To what extent is furniture/equipment scaled to child size?																																	
3. What other equipment is available, (magnets, books, puppet stage, blocks etc.)?																				X													X

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Interview			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	MUELLER	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	LIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen FRI	Cl Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cl	PPR-Ct	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
4. How is equipment arranged?																																	
a. To what extent is equipment arranged in discernible storage areas? Perceptual clarity of storage designations?																					X												X
b. To what extent is teacher help required for children to have access to equipment?																							X										X
c. To what extent can equipment be carried and rearranged to other locations for use?										X																							X
d. To what extent is equipment arranged to encourage or discourage joint usage of several kinds of equipment simultaneously?																																X	X
F. SCHEDULING OF EQUIPMENT USAGE																																	
1. What proportion of equipment is always available?																																	
2. What equipment is introduced and removed?																																	
3. What is rationale for introduction and removal?																																	
4. What is schedule for introduction and removal?																																	
G. OTHER INDOOR FACILITIES																																	
1. What toilet facilities are utilized?																																	

	OBSERVATION																					SELF-REPORT										MIX	
	Teacher								Child							Composite						Inter view			Questionnaire								
	CSCC	Mueller	ORF	P.O.T.	STARS	TBSI	TOS	TPPR	APPRO	B-S-I	CRB	IIOS	LAMI	PROSE	SIOS	C.O.F.	D-B.Beh	OSCI	Pr-Bl	PEI	Pedersen	Ch-TS	Ch-Ad.V	PPIWT	Cen-FRI	Cl-Reg	Med-Den	PPR-Cls	PPR-Ct.	S. Info	SEM	CFRI	Sher
a. To what extent are toilet facilities accessible to children without teacher intervention?																				X												X	
b. Are toilet facilities scaled to child size?																																X	
c. To waht extent are they arranged to encourage conjoint usage?																																	
2. What other facilities are available for use, i.e. library, kitchen,etc?																									X							X	

To recapitulate, two rather separate endeavors were initially undertaken in regard to this survey. First, existent procedures for assessing parameters of preschool programs were identified. Second, various resources were used to formulate a list of items early childhood educators and researchers seem to assume have relevance in considering programs for young children. The preceding section presented the cross-comparison of these to assess the extent to which there is coverage.

An examination of Table III reveals that there were certain items on the program variation list which are assessed by a number of procedures. The teacher-child interactions, for example, seem to receive most attention. Items such as extent of interaction, characteristics of verbal interactions, the content of interaction, and the extent to which child initiations are responded to were frequently checked on the preceding charts as in some way assessed by a number of different procedures.

A number of procedures are also seen as determining whether discrimination, attention, etc. were being emphasized in programs, whether preplanned specific instruction was used, whether there was direct instruction in language usage./ The common concern of these three items seems to be the degree of teacher direction. Two other frequently checked items in the cross comparisons seem to be also concerned with the issue of teacher direction. These items concern the number of children teacher interacts with simultaneously and the number of alternatives available to children in the classroom during given time periods. Evidently many of the authors of procedures would concur in expecting that important parameters of program center in the issues of amount and kind of adult interaction and the amount and kind of direction of child involvement.

Of interest also are those areas on the list of possible program variation which were never or seldom sought by any of the procedures examined. For example, there was seldom a documentation of general program goals, purposes of program (whether investigative, demonstrative, etc.) or the rationale of any established pre-planned curriculum. The assumption is no doubt made in the construction of procedures that behavioral data will reflect the effect of these factors as program parameters. Some additional record of these might be worthwhile, however, since the nature and degree of specificity of goal, purpose, curricular rationale may effect the consistency with which observed behaviors are likely to be maintained across total program periods.

Four other areas are evidently just not considered at all in data collecting for program evaluation, e.g. whether instruction is provided outside the actual school setting, the scheduling of equipment used during the program span, attendance, or psychological characteristics of individual children. The first of these may reflect the absence of conditions in most programs providing for any kinds of comparisons. The latter two are probably not considered program variables by most assessors. If one conceives of program as that which provides input to children, however, the presence/absence and the characteristics of other children in the group may indeed be important to consider.

The detailed examination of each of the procedures for this cross-comparison led to the following conclusions. First, it seemed quite evident that relatively few procedures screened in a very wide spectrum of the elements included in the list of possible program variation. Thus, when assessments of programs are obtained via any of these single procedures much of what may be of relevance to consider, according to different educators and researchers, remains unknown. And, unfortunately, those procedures found to obtain the widest span of coverage may also be the least precise in that they rely on general narrative and/or impressionistic reports of staff or non-staff observers. Thus, although the Sher procedures, as indicated in the charts, provide a broad coverage, this is accomplished via narrative-descriptive observations and interviews. Such an assessment may have great value for some purposes, i.e., self-insights for the school staff and parent body, but has little utility for cross-program comparisons. Relatively few procedures examined could be described as both comprehensive and metrically rigorous.

A second obvious conclusion from this entire effort is that there is enormous dissimilarity between what actually _is_ assessed by the thirty-three procedures. To a certain extent each procedure assessed for some items on the Program Variation list. Except for the items discussed previously there was little overlap between procedures on what was screened in. There were frequently found to be items on some of the procedures which were not encompassed on the prepared list of Program Variation. Of interest was the fact that there was little overlap between procedures on many of these "additional items". Although on close examination some of these only _seemed different_ from each other and from the Program Variation listings in that they were conceived at a different level of specificity - i.e., "tattled" as an item to be checked for an individual child on one procedure may fall in the same general classification as "teacher encouraged self-reliance" on another. One can only conclude from these disparities that there currently is a very imprecise and incomplete conceptualization amoung educators and measurement specialists as to what constitutes "program" for young children. It is obvious that no general taxonomy has been developed nor does it seem likely that one could be readily forthcoming.

These comments, of course, are addressed only to the determination via procedures of data on programs. They have nothing to do with a second question, do these components have any bearing on determinable changes in different children, in these programs.

Discussion of Findings and Issues

The preceding discussion dealt specifically with the results of a content comparison between procedures and the criterion list of program variation. Additional findings and issues having practical, metric, design and theoretical implications will be discussed next.

Beyond the previously cited generalizations concerning the thirty-three procedures these are several other basic considerations which came into "figure" from these search and analysis efforts.

Practical Considerations

Several findings from this survey bear on the practicality of using procedures for progarm assessment. In comparing one assessment procedure with another, one notes, for example, considerable variation in the amount of training necessary for use of given procedures. There exists a range from no training for some of the self-report measures to several days or weeks training in the use of more complex observational procedures (APPROACH, B-S-I, CSCC). Some of the procedures suggest a particular orientation, i.e., the ORF manual specifies a person knowledgeable in educational psychology; the Preschool Environment Inventory specifies a person familiar with the Child Development approach to early education. PROSE, on the other hand reportedly cna be effectively used by indigenous non-professionals.

A second practical consideration concerns the amount of time required to collect data. This refers to both the total amount of data specified as necessary and the time considerations in obtaining it. In the cases of some procedures reviewed the data collection may only require a brief observation or perhaps a twenty-minute phone conversation during any part of the program year. At the other extreme, extensive amounts of observation time may be necessary, perhaps at precisely specified protions of program days or for program events. When programs to be observed are from 50 to 500 miles apart, these become important considerations.

A third consideration is related to the state of the data once obtained, that is, the degree to which it must be reprocessed, reformated, recorded, etc. prior to analysis. APPROACH probably holds the record at one extreme for amount of processing time, in that original narrative descriptions must be coded into "numerical language" requiring hours of effort beyond the original observations. Once accomplished, however, the data is in a form accessible for varied kinds of computer analysis. On the other extreme the PROSE observer records directly onto a machine scorable form which requires no further preparation prior to analysis. At a mid-point are procedures where a limited amount of "setting-up" of obtained data is necessary.

The above issues are reflected in a fourth consideration, the over-all costs of program assessment. For some procedures, theoretically, one could collect data via a telephone conversation with responses in the interview being placed on computer scoreable and analyzeable "answer sheets". Even with "set-up" time added into the total figure this style might provide a reasonable and relatively inexpensive approach for some kinds of assessment. This is in direct contract to costs for individual child observations which are high from the beginning even when machine scoreable techniques (as with PROSE) are employed. Selection and training of observers, travel and class contact time totals to a considerable amount.

These practical issues are, of course, not independent from metric, design and conceptual concerns. The critical question often not addressed, however, is whether the study be undertaken at all if the costs of obtaining relevant data are too high. The taxpayer might well-be saved some considerable expense were this question raised more frequently.

Metric Considerations

Reliability and validity are the two metric issues addressed in most discussions concerning procedures for assessing people. While these issues remain a requirement in discussions on program environment assessment they become somewhat more

more ambigous, however, first, because the coefficient to be utilized has a less well-established rationale, and, second, because what is reliability and what is validity evidence can shift for this kind of assessment.

In many of the instruments cited, no reliability estimates were as yet available; for others, reliability seemed not to be a consideration. The reliabilities that were reported were based on interobserver or interrater agreement - either a correlation or percentage of agreement. Some reliability estimates were based on all items included in the procedure, other for sub-groups of items. In some instances, where an observer had the responsibility for the initial selection of the chunks or sequences of behavior or settings to be recorded for subsequent analysis, two separate reliability estimates were determined. One reliability score was reckoned for agreement on only those chunks commonly included by two observers simultaneously making records of the same situation; another separate analysis was made between all behavior included by either.

Although these different conditions for arranging data were found, most reliability was sought in terms of actual agreement between different persons who have had the same training in definitions, codes, etc. for a given procedure. Establishing that two or more observers agree a large portion of the time is a reasonable approach when that figure is an unbiased estimate of the overt occurence of phenomena. Unfortunately, the fact is that many, if not most, reliability estimates presented in this fashion are not, in fact, unbiased - as can be demonstrated when one makes comparisons between sets of observers across programs. Either observers disagree and then discuss the data to some kind of reconciliation or (worse) they agree, because they have worked together for a considerable period of time and thus know intuitively the partner's perception, but would, in fact, not be saying the same thing were they paired off with other observers, even though these other observers had been trained in the identical procedure.

Other reliability coefficients which might have been used are noticeably absent. While PROSE reliabilities currently utilize Spearman-Brown corrected split-half techniques, and may well eventually be determined with Kuder-Richardson or other forms of analysis of variance reliability estimates, it, with the exceptoin of the B-S-I, stands very much alone in this regard.

Perhaps developers of other procedures may build reliability into the data analysis phase (as with PROSE and B-S-I) instead of the observation phase. Since the procedures reviewed are very much in the developmental form, these data have not as yet been publicly reported but might yet be forthcoming. On the other hand, observer agreement seems very much in the minds of researchers reporting procedures to date, suggesting that alternative estimates are not being considered. The Medlay (1968) and Medley and Mitzel (1963) alternative rationale of making intro-observer comparisons of split data for repeated observations on the same subjects or classrooms deserves considerable attention.

How validity is viewed in program environment assessment depends on an additional conceptual issue, namely, does the researcher build in or have available independent measures of child changes, (e.g. cognitive, social-emotional, physical, etc.). When these independent measures are available validity in program assessment procedures may be viewed as differences in program factors which make or are associated reliably with differences in measurements of child changes. When independent child-change measures are not available, validity means something else; usually one of the validity concepts discussed by Cronbach and Meehl (1955) and evidenced by correlational or factored relationships between a program measure and other program measures. The preference of this writer is with the former type of validity position whenever possible, with the latter view extending the concept of reliability. With this distinction applied to concern for the metric adequacy of program-environment assessment procedures perhaps some of the recently reported difficulties in procedure development might be avoided. Nuthall (1968) quotes Komisar as indicating,

> "We are rapidly approaching chaos in the production, by researchers, of "new" category systems. No one seems able or willing to tell us why certain categories are chosen or how one researcher's categories bear on those of another."

The presence of criteria against which to determine "differences that make differences"in programs could act to assist in reducing this problem. Attention might also then shift to alternative modes of determining reliability of program environments suggested by Medley (1968) and discussed by Dopyera (1969).

Design and Conceptual Issues

When funding arrangements are inaugurated from governmental or other agencies for new programs, there is frequently some provision, although usually minimal, for research and evaluation. Although experimental research would be desirable, it is costly and may additionally be difficult to generalize from two other settings. Therefore, the bulk of research and evaluation under present funding arrangements has been and probably will continue to be the documentation of what exists in ongoing naturalistic settings. The program assessment procedures discussed in this report have been primarily used in this respect - that is, documenting what exists in programs which have not been experimentally arranged to test certain hypotheses. The data has then been used to assist in such endeavors as general conceptualizing about program parameters, in determining correlational relationships or for monitoring for quality control. Attempts to date to conduct this kind of naturalistic assessment, however, have varied so much in purpose, in conceptualization, and in execution that there are almost more differences than commonalitites. The task of summarizing them and analyzing them is therefore a difficult one.

The inconsistent use of terminology, general lack of definition, or absence of similarity of concept usuage by researchers and/or program personnel have created problems to the completion of this survey. This has been pervasive throughout the entire effort; first, when attempting to determine what components existed in programs as described by program directors or researchers; next, when attempting to compare procedures; and finally, when comparing procedures with the criterion list of program components which had been developed.

The general lack of comparable operational terminology is a difficult problem to resolve because while acknowledged by many as critical, it is difficult, if not impossible, to receive funding for its solution. The criterion list of program variations included in this report, while a beginning, should not be viewed as anything more than that. Much work is needed for concept clarification refinement and operationalization. In addition, the procedure characteristics included in the cross comparison vary considerably. It is to be expected, given the lack of explicitness in procedure and program component descriptions, that many authors of procedures will take serious issue with us regarding what their procedure does and does not include. All of this, of course, does nothing more than point out the necessity of yet considerable work in definitional and conceptual clarification.

One of the conceptual issues having important validity implications concerns the screening effect of categories and items of each assessment procedure. It is obvious that procedures are employed to screen in only certain portions of the reality as it is encountered. This screening process is intentionally effected via the selection of items and/or questions in the procedure. In addition to merely screening-in and screening-out portions of the reporter's experience as he perceives it, the items/questions serve to impose a certain structure to it. The labels, the categories, the sequence of categories, etc. are selected to reduce the total complexity to something the author feels will be both analyzable and, in some sense, meaningful. The user is asked to accept the author's selection of behavior chunks to be dealt with as, in fact, validly representing important aspects of that reality. When one examines and compares several such procedures, however, it becomes quite clear that he is to some extent inventing this reality through his selection and rejection of items.

To illustrate this point, consider how the various procedures might "view" the following episode of behavior: Susy is in her class with fifteen other children of the same age, mixed socio-economic status and race with two middle-class white female teachers. Susy leaves the group who are sitting or reclining on the floor listening to a story. She goes to the drinking fountain across the room. Her teacher stops reading the story and says emphatically,

"Susy, sit down right here beside Joey so you can see the book."

Susy keeps on drinking water

Consider how the above episode might be recorded by observers using various procedures. An SIOS observer would see [illegible] only the interaction in terms of frequency and identification of the interactors. If an APPROACH observer were on hand his record might first read somewhat as the words above and would eventually be found to contain only digits such as 00369, etc. which would correspond to the following: Central figure terminates contact with group(including Central figure)- (no information supplied), etc.

A B-S-I observer, on the other hand, might be checking items such as "Intact class," a teacher sanction of "S location" with no S responses, indicating the number of children at that point in time as the "watch/listen" activity and in other activities etc. A Sher observer might record it in narrative form and later insert it as part of an extensive written report as evidence substantiating the teacher's interview statement that she believes in using"a positive approach to discipline." The STARS observer would consider it as a teacher engaged in behavior management of teacher operants. While all of these observers would be focusing on the child/teacher behaviors as important dimensions, one is struck by the diversity of data obtained. Of course, under some other procedures, the observer would ignore this interchange entirely while busily recording "equipment available" or some other kind of data.

There are certainly striking differences between what respective developers consider to be significant aspects of program to be screened in by their assessment procedures. The questions of extent to which any of these diverse views are, first, valid, and, second, useful, seem largely unanswerable at this point. Only under conditions where an assessment procedure of program parameters can show variation between programs, which is found to be related to changes in children, can the worth of the procedural conceptualization be determined.

The remarks in the previous paragraphs presuppose the following assumptions that these writers make about assessment: (1) that there is a reality to be observed; (2) that it is filtered first through the perceptual framework of the observer and/or reporter; (3) that it is further filtered through the items and/or questions prescribed within the given assessment procedures being used; (4) that these filtering processes will produce data which can logically or statistically be arranged into dimensions; (5) that these dimensions may be found to make a difference for children for given criteria: (6) that these findings can eventually provide guidance in arranging programs for given purposes.

The cited set of assumptions must be recognized, however, as evidently not necessarily representative of thinking in the field. Nor, for that matter, can any set of assumptions be cited as guiding program evaluation efforts generally. In fact, the overall impression from this search effort was that there is great need for attention to conceptualization concerning program assessment at all levels and this, of course, includes preschool. There has, for example, evidently been little thought to distinction between or similarities of the kind of assessment techniques desirable for basic research vs. applied research vs. evaluation and training. Evidence of this are the instances in which observed behaviors identified as related to certain outcomes in laboratory studies are written into questionaires for self-report forms to be widely used without thought to the possible difference in the kind of data obtained via the two approaches.

Or consider the number of student-teacher evaluation rating scales in daily use with no concern as to whether these behaviors or qualities are of any importance in regard to desired goals/outcomes for children. The suggestion that these items could, and possibly should, be validated against some criterion seems to surprise many people.

Summary

The task of this report was considered to be that of identifying and examining existent procedures for assessing parameters of preschool programs. Thirty-three such procedures were selected as most appropriate for preschool program assessment (which had not been fully discussed in other documents). The examination of the procedures included determining wherein they assessed for aspects of possible program variation compiled from program descriptions, consultation with educators, and visitations. The findings may be summarized as follows:

(1) Certain aspects of program were assessed by many of the procedures. These included amount and kind of teacher-child interactions, amount and kind of direction of child involvement. Although the cross-analysis revealed that many procedures sought information on these areas, there were great dissimilaries in means and precise content of information being sought.

(2) Some aspects of program were never or rarely obtained by any of the procedures, i.e., program goals, purposes of program, rationale of pre-planned curricula, instruction outside the school setting, scheduling of euqipment use across program span, attendance, psychological characteristics of individual children.

(3) Most procedures focus on a very narrow portion of what could be considered total program. Those procedures which were found to obtain broader coverage were of the narrative type and lacked the precision of assessment necessary for cross-program comparisons.

(4) Procedures were, in general, quite dissimilar from each other in what they assessed and even when assessing for

the same aspects of program, they varied drastically in their conceptualizations of those aspects (as reflected in actual items included).

Beyond actual content of program assessed by the thirty-three procedures, some analysis of other characteristics were considered and may be summarized as follows:

(1) There were considerable differences between procedures on practical considerations such as amount of training necessary for their use, amount of time required to collect data, the degree to which data must be reprocessed prior to analysis, and overall cost of use.

(2) There is a lack of consistency and inadequate conceptualization in regard to obtaining reliability estimates. Further consideration of intra-observer reliability for program assessment was suggested (in contrast to intra-observer agreement).

(3) There is a similar need for more careful consideration of the meaning of validity as it refers to program assessment. The view was expressed that for program assessment validity might best be considered to be based on criteria of relationship to child change rather than on relationship to other program measures.

(4) There is need for substantial attention to seeking some commonality in terminology and conceptualization in regard to parameters of programs. Even more basic is the need for some consensus as to what assessment actually means in relation to program. Some assumptions the writers hold as to assessment were outlined in the last section.

The overall impression from this study was that until some superordinate structuring is proposed, developed, and generally accepted as a guide to further efforts in program assessment, the present chaotic situation with minimal contribution for practical concerns of program guidance will continue. This is not to say that revisions would not be necessary to such a conceptualization. What is being said is that there is a great need for a broader look at what program assessment is all about to avoid the constant proliferation of piecemeal attempts to do again in a slightly different way what appears to have been relatively unproductive in previous efforts.

Recommendations

As all programs would not be expected to influence different children in the same way, these recommendations concern a way of conceptualizing and assessing interactions between programs, children, and behavior changes in child participants.

As children in the same molar environment often bring to bear different histories and expectations and in addition then encounter different experiences, the program encounters of a given child need to be determined. Individual child observations which include documentation of both how the environment impinges on the child and how the child utilizes his environment, and what contextual constraints and facilitators exist, would be required. Procedures which document only facets of the environment generally present in the child's molar environment do not accomodate this objective.

As the same kind and/or intensity of program encounter might be expected to influence different children in different ways, analysis of program data should be undertaken relative to individual differences of children. It would be expected that if analysis is not done relative to individual differences, that is, if all children within a given program (type) were lumped together for purposes of analysis, interactions would be cancelled out. The consequences of this cancellation effect would be that fewer significant differences would be determined.

As program factors interacting with child individual difference factors might be relevant (show differences) for some criteria but not for others, multiple criterion measures (obtained pre and post with care exercised to control for practice effects) should be available as part of procedure and program validation attempts.

REFERENCES

Anderson, H. The measurement of dominative and of socially integrative behavior in teachers' contacts with children. Child Development, 1939, 10, 73-89.

Barker, R. G. Ecological Psychology. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.

Barker, R. G. The Stream of Behavior. New York: Wiley 1963

Bereiter, C. and Engelmann, S. An academically oriented preschool for disadvantaged children: results from the initial experimental group. In D. W. Brison and Jane Hill (Eds.), Psychology and Early Childhood Education. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.

Bereiter, C. Instructional planning in early compensatory education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1967, 48, 355-359

Bereiter, C. and Engelmann S. Observations on the use of direct instruction with young disadvantaged children, Journal of School Psychology, 1966, 4, 55-62

Bereiter, C and Englemann, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall 1966.

Berry, C.F., Shipman, V.C. and Hess, R.D. An analysis of preschool teachers' speech styles using the cognitive stimulation coding categories (CSCC). Paper presented at AERA annual meeting, 1969.

Beyer, E. Teaching Young Children. New York: Pegasus, 1968

Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education. Description of Pre-Kindegarten Program. Albany, New York: New York State Education Department, no date

Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education, Pre-Kindergarten Programs: Indoor and Outdoor Spaces for Three and Four Year Old Children. Albany New York: New York State Education Department, no date.

Caldwell, B.M. and Richmond, J.B. The Children's Center - A Microcosmic Health, Education and Welfare Unit. Syracuse, New York; Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Syracuse, New York, 1967.

Caldwell, B. M., Honig, A.S. and Wynn, R. C. Coding Manual for Approach (A Procedure for Patterning Responses of Adults and Children). Unpublished document, no date.

Caldwell, B. M. A new APPROACH to behavioral ecology. Unpublished document, no date.

Caldwell, B. M. and Richmond, J. B. Programmed Day Care for the very young child. A preliminary report. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 481-488

Caldwell, B.M., What is the optimal learning environment for the young child? American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1967 37, 8-21.

Cassileth, B. Unpublished document, 1966.

Coleman, J.S. Social Climates in High Schools. Cooperative Research Monograph No.4. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961

Cooper, W., Circirelli, V.G. and Granger, R.L. The School Environment Measure. Athens, Ohio: Westinghouse Learning Corporation/ Ohio University.

Cronbach, L.J., and Meehl, P.E. Construct validity and psychological testing. Psychological Bulletin 1955, 52, 281-302.

Deutsch, M. Interim Progress Report to Ford Foundation. Institute for Developmental Studies, Unpublished document, New York University, 1967.

The Deutsch Model: Institute for Developmental Studies. New York University. Eric Document PS 000927, no date.

Development and Research Center for Early Education. The Picture Story of DARCEE. Nashville, Tennessee: DARCEE, 1967

Dopyera, J. Assessing the microenvironments of individual preschool children. Final report to Office of Economic Opportunity Research Contract 4120. Syracuse University Head Start Evaluation and Research Project, 1969.

Dopyera, J. *Behavior - Sanction-Interaction: Preliminary Manual*. Dittoed document, 1969.

Dopyera, J., Hollingshead, L. and Lindstrom, D. *Post Observation* Teacher Rating Scales (P.O.T.) Mimeographed report. Syracuse University, 1968.

Dopyera, J., Lindstrom D., and Hollingshead, L. *Manual for Integrated Individual Observation Schedule*. Dittoed document, 1968.

The Durham Educational Improvement Program 1966-67:EIP Research. Durham, North Carolina: EIP, 1967.

Educational Testing Service. *Classroom Observation Form*. Office of Economic Opportunity, Head Start, 1966.

Engelmann, S. Priorities in preschool education. In D.W. Brison and Jane Hill (Eds.), *Psychology and Early Childhood Education*. Toronto, Ontario. Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, 1968.

Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study. *The Eliot-Pearson Childrens' School*. Tufts University, brochure, no date.

Feldman, Shirley. A preschool enrichment program for disadvantaged children. In F.Hechinger (Ed.) *PreSchool Education Today*. Garden City: New York: Doubleday, 1966.

Findley, W.G. Early Education as Continuous Stimulation. Paper given at 21st Annual Teacher Education Conference, Athens, Georgia. 1968.

Frazier, A.,(Ed.)*Early Childhood Education Today*. Washington, D.C.: ASCD-NEA, 1968.

Frost, J.L.,(Ed.)*Early Childhood Education Rediscovered:Readings*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Gage, N.L., Ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1963

Garfunkel, F. Classroom Behavior Form (CRB): Instruction for recording behavior of child in classroom situation. Dittoed report, 1968.

Geer, B. First days in the Field. In P.E. Hammond, Ed. Sociologist at Work. Basic Books, 1964.

Gordon, I.J. A Parent-Education Approach to Provision of Early Stimulation for the Culturally Disadvantaged. Gainesville, Florida: Institute for Development of Human Resources, 1967.

Gordon, I.J. and Lally, J.R. Intellectual Stimulation for Infants and Toddlers. Gainesville, Florida; Institute for the Development of Human Resources, 1967.

Gray, W., Klaus, R.A., Miller, J.G. and Forrester, B.J. Before First Grade; The Early Training Project for Culturally Disadvantaged Children. New York:Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1966.

Gray, S.W. and Klaus, R. An experimental preschool program for culturally deprived children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 887-898.

Gump, P.V. Ecological Variables. Paper presented at AERA annual meeting, 1968.

Gump, P.V. Environmental guidance of the classroom behavioral system. In B.J. Biddle, Ed. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Hall,Rinehart and Winston,1964.

Gump, P.V. Prediction of teacher behavior. Paper presented at AERA annual meeting, 1967.

Gump P.V. Setting Variables and the Prediction of Teacher Behavior Paper presented at AERA annual meeting, 1967.

Halpin, A.W. and Croft, D.B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago; Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1963.

Hamlin, R., Mukerji, R. and Yonemura, M. Schools for Young Disadvantaged Children. New York: Teachers College. Columbia University, 1967

Hechinger, F.M., Ed. Pre-School Education Today. Garden City New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966.

Hess, R.D. and Bear, M. Early Education: Current Theory, Research and Action. Chicago: Aldine, 1968.

Hess, R.D. and Shipman, V.C. Early experience and the socialization tion of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 869 - 886.

Hooper, F.H. and Marshall W.H. The Initial Phase of a Preschool Curriculum Development Project: Final Report. Morgantown, West Virginia, West Virginia University, 1968.

Horton, Della, M., A Training Program for Mothers. Mimeographed report from Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education. George Peabody College for Teachers, no date.

Hymes, J.L., Jr. Teaching the Child Under Six. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1968..

Institute for Developmental Studies. Interim Progress Report. Part II. Research and Evaluation. Unpublished document, IDS, New York University, 1968.

Johnson, C.E. Developing objectives for the educational program--pre-primary. Unpublished report from University of Georgia Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation, 1967.

Johnson, C. E. and Powell L.D. Report I: Initiating the Pre-primary Unit. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia, Instructional Demonstration Center, 1966.

Johnson, O.G. and Bommarita, J.W. A Study of Measurement Resources in Child Research. Project Head Start. O.E.O. Contract #2452. Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University,no date

Jones, S.H. Manual for the Checklist of Administrative Variables. Unpublished document, September, 1968.

Katz, L.G. A Study of the changes in behavior of children enrolled in two types of Head Start classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, 1968.

Katz, L.G., Peters, D.L. and Stein, N.S. Observing Behavior in Kindergarten and preschool classes. Unpublished document, no date.

Klaus, R.A. and Gray, S.W. The Early Training Project for Disadvantaged: A Report After Five Years. Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1968, 33, (4, Serial No. 120), 1-66.

Kohlberg, L. Montessori with the culturally disadvantaged. In Hess R.D. and Bear, R. (Ed.), Early Education. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine, 1968.

Lavetelli, C.B. Critical overview of early childhood education programs. Paper presented at Head Start Conference. Eric document, no date.

McCartney, J. A Good Day for the Twos and Threes. Nursery School Portfolio, Leaflet #2. Wahsington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1961.

MdDonald, J.B. A proper curriculum for young children. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, L; #7, 406-408.

Macklin, E.D., Harding, J. and Fodor, E. Cornell Story-Reading Program. Ithaca, New York: Cornell Research Program in Early Childhood Education, Brochure, No date.

Medley, D.M. "Measurement Rationale" in Disadvantaged Children and their First School Experiences. ETS-OEO Longitudinal study. Theoretical considerations and measurement strategies. Report under OEO Contract #4206 and OEO Grant #C6-8256. December, 1968.

Medley, D.M. "Oscar goes to the Nursery School" A new technique for observing pupil behavior. Paper presented at AERA, Los Angeles, California. February, 1969.

Medley, D.M. and Mitzel, H.E. Measuring classroom behavior by systematic observation. In N.L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research in Teaching. Chicago; Rand McNally, 1963

Medley, D.M., Schluck, C.G., and Ames, N.P. Recording Individual Pupil Experiences in the Classroom: A Manual for PROSE Recorders. Princeton, New Jersey; Educational Testing Service.

Meyer, W.J. and Thompson, G.G. Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth-grade children. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1956,47,385-396.

Montessori, M. The Montessori Method, translated by Anne George. Cambridge, Mass: Robert Bentley, 1964. (Original edition, Frederick Stokes, 1912).

Mort, P.R., Burke, A.J. and Fisk, R.S. A Guide for the Analysis and Description of Public School Services. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1944.

Mueller, J. F. Exploratory study of the psychological ecology of a directed lesson in a nursery school setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1968.

Office of Economic Opportunity. Parent and Child Centers: A Guide for the Development of Parent and Child Centers. Washington, D.C.: O.E.O.

Office of Economic Opportunity: Project Head Start. Center Facilities and Resources Inventory. Form CAP-HS-52, 1968.

Office of Economic Opportunity: Project Head Start. Class Register. CAP-HS Form 35

Office of Economic Opportunity: Project Head Start. Medical/Dental Information. CAP-HS Form 31

Office of Economic Opportunity: Project Head Start. Parent Participation Record: Class Activities. For CAP-HS Form 45a.

Office of Economic Opportunity:Project Head Start. Parent Participation: Center Activities. Form CAP-HS-45.

Office of Economic Opportunity: Project Head Start. Post Program Interview with Teacher. Questionnaire Form.

Office of Economic Opportunity: Project Head Start. Staff Member Information. Form CAP-HS-43

Orem, R.C. Ed. A Montessori Handbook. New York: Capricorn Books. 1965.

Pedersen, F. and Fox D. Codebook. Washington; National Institutes of Child Health and Development, no date.

Pierce-Jones, J., Caldwell, W., Lynn, E.L. Observer Rating Form University of Texas, no date .

Pitcher, E. G. and Ames, L.B. The Guidance Nursery School. New York: Dell, 1964.

Powledge, F. To Change a Child: A Report on the Institute for Developmental Studies. Chicago: Quadrangle Books of Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1967.

Rambusch, N.M. Learning How to Learn: An American Approach to Montessori. Baltimore: Helicon, 1962.

Read, H. The Nursery School: A Human Relations Laboratory. Fourth edition. Philadelphia; W. B. Saunders, 1966.

Remmers, H.H. Rating methods in research on teaching. In N.L. Gage, Ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago; Rand McNally, 1963 Pp329-378.

Sackett, L., Ed. and Feldman, L., Director. Take One Giant Step: Parents Make a Difference. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse City School District.

Schoggen, M.F. An Ecological Approach to the Study of Mother-Child Interaction. Unpublished report, no date.

Schoggen, P.and Schoggen, M.F. Behavior Units in Observational Research. Paper presented at APA annual meeting, 1968.

Sher, A. et.al. Procedures for classroom observation. Informal paper, no date.

Simon, A. and Boyer, E.G. (Eds.) *Mirrors for Behavior* (Vol I-V). Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc. 1967.

Spaulding, R.L. The Durham Education Improvement Program. In Brison, D.W. and Hill, Jane, Eds. *Psychology and Early Childhood Education*. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute of Developmental Studies, 1966.

Spicker, H.H., Hodges, W. L. and McCandless, B.R. *A Diagnostically-Based Curriculum for Psycho-Socially Deprived Preschool Mentally Retarded Children: Interim Report*. Paper presented at Convention of Council for Exceptional Children, Toronto, Ontario, 1966.

Sprigle, H., Sprigle, J., Van de Riet, V., and Van de Riet, H. *A Fresh Approach to Early Childhood Education and a Study of its Effectiveness*. Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Jacksonville, Florida: Learning to Learn School, Inc., 1967.

Stearns, K., Hodges, W. and Spicker, H. *Interim Report: A Diagnostically-Based Language Curriculum for Psycho-Socially Deprived PreSchool Children*.Paper presented at AERA, Chicago, 1966.

Stern, C. *Observation of Substantive Curricular Input: Manual.* U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. August, 1968.

Stern, G. G. Characteristics of the intellectual climate of college environments. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1963,33,5-41.

Stern, G.G. and Steinhoff, C.R. *Organizational Climate Index*.

Stern, V. and Gordon A. *Development of Observation Procedures for Assessing Preschool Classroom Environment*: Document 4. Bank Street Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. December, 1967.

U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. *Characteristics of Teaching Staff*. Mimeographed form,September, 1968.

U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Office. *Class Facilities and Resources Inventory*. Dittoed form, September, 1968.

University of Kansas Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. *Social Interaction Observation Procedure: Training Manual-Additions*.

Van de Riet, V. and Van de Riet H., *An Evaluation of the Effects of a Unique Sequential Learning Program on Culturally Deprived Children*. Unpublished report submitted to Office of Economic Opportunity. Gainesville, Florida: College of Health-Related Professions, University of Florida,1966.

Weikart,D.P., Kamii, K., and Radin, N.L. *Perry Preschool Project: Progress Report*, 1964.

Weikart, D. P. Preliminary Results from a Longitudinal Study of Disadvantaged Preschool Children. Paper presented at Convention of Council for Exceptional Children, St. Louis, Mo., 1967.

Wilensky, H. *Observational Techniques in Preschool Classrooms*. Unpublished document, Institute for Developmental Studies. New York University, 1966.

Withall, J. The development of a climate index. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1951, 45, 93-99.

Wolf, A.D. *A Parents' Guide to the Montessori Classroom*. Altoona, Pa.,: Penn-Mont Academy, undated.

Wright, H.F. Observational child study, In P.H. Mussen, Ed. *Handbook of Research in Child Development*. New York Wiley. 1960.

APPENDIX

Procedure Descriptions

NAME: A Procedure for Patterning Responses of Adults and Children (APPROACH)

DEVELOPERS: Betty M. Caldwell, Alice S. Honig, and Ruth Wynn
Children's Center
Syracuse University-Upstate Medical Center
Syracuse, New York 13210

METHOD: Observation-individual child based

SCOPE: S. behavior, Teacher Behavior, curriculum, physical plant and facilities

DATA FORMAT: Verbal transcribed to codes

PERSONNEL: Non-program

A Procedure for Patterning Responses of Adults and Children, (APPROACH) has two major phases. There is first recorded a narrative description of observed behaviors emitted by a target individual and by the people with whom he interacts or in whose vicinity he functions. Each statement of behavior contains four components — the subject (who or what emits the act), the predicate (what is done), the object (toward whom or what the act is directed and any necessary supplementary information (qualifiers) of the action). The second phase requires that each of the components recorded verbally be coded into numerical classifications to facilitate computer analysis. A summary of the major categories and assigned numbers follows at the conclusion of this description. It will be noted that if the verbal phrase describing the action of a target individual has been recorded as "Helen wipes up the crumbs on the table.", it would be coded as 0-central figure; 61 - caretakes; 1-the environment; 9-no information, which expressed as a numerical sentence is 06119.

In current usage the narrative verbal description is spoken into a tape recorder by a trained observer. Coding is done later directly from the tapes, when the coders become proficient. Prior to the high degree of familiarity necessary for direct tape coding, the preparation of typescripts is necessary. Caldwell (1968) reported a 12 to 16 hour lag in time between making an observation and having a computerized record of that behavior.

Since the procedures of APPROACH require two separate phases,reliability figures are necessary for each. For the first phase,inter-observer reliabilities for each sentence component were computed as well as for the total statement. When only statements that both observers included were considered,the reliabilities were .99 for subject, .85 for predicate,.82 for object., .85 for the qualifier, .64 for total. When all statements made by either observer were considered,reliabilities were, respectively, .65, .55, .53, .58, .42. The second phase required the determination of inter-coder reliabilities which were respectively, .99, .86, .82, .60 when only commonly made statements were included and .87, .76, .70, .70, .52 when all statements were included.

References:

Caldwell, B.M. A new APPROACH to behavioral ecology. Unpublished document, no date.

Caldwell, B.M., Honig, A.S., and Wynn, R.L. Coding manual for APPROACH (A procedure for patterning responses of adults and children) Unpublished document, no date.

Children's Medical Center, Syracuse, New York

Table 1. Summary of the major APPROACH Behavior Categories and the numbers assigned each in the code.

BEHAVIORS

I Subject of Behavioral Clause (1st digit)

0 Central Figure (CF)
1 The environment
2 Female Adult
3 Female Child
4 Item
5 Male child
6 Group, including CF
7 Group, excluding CF
8 Male Adult
9 Setting alert

II Behavioral Predicates (2nd and 3rd digits)

Environmental Contact (00-09)

00 Ignores
01 Attends
02 Establishes or maintains contact
03 Terminates Contact
04 Scans

Information Processing (10-19)

10 Confirms
11 Shows (to) or demonstrates (for)
12 Communicates or converses
13 Writes or draws (for)
14 Reads
15 Corrects or disconfirms
16 Inquires
17 Informs or teaches
18 Informs about culture
19 Dramatizes (for)

Food Behavior (20-24)

20 Gives food (to)

Food Behavior (cont'd)

21 Takes or handles food
22 Takes or manipulates food
23 Transports food (to)
24 Disorganizes with food

Manual Activities (25-29)

25 Transfers item (to or toward)
26 Takes (from) or handles item
27 Manipulates item
28 Transports item (to)
29 Throws or rolls item (to)

Negative Reinforcement (30-39)

30 Withholds sanction (from)
31 Shows discomfort
32 Expresses displeasure (to)
33 Criticizes or derogates
34 Expresses hostility
35 Interferes or restricts
36 Resists or rejects
37 Threatens or frightens
38 Assaults

Positive Reinforcement (40-49)

40 Permits or sanctions
41 Expresses solicitude
42 Shows Pleasure.
43 Approves, encourages
44 Expresses affection
45 Facilitates
46 Excuses
47 Bargains, promises
48 Protects, defends

Body Activities (50-59)

50 Increases or accelerates
51 Decreases or retards activity
52 Perioralizes
53 Acts in situ
54 Adjusts or accomodates

Body Activities (cont'd)

55 Provide inesthetic stimulation
56. Locomotes (toward)
57 LMA's
58 Marches, dances or rhythmicizes
59. Voids or excretes

Miscellaneous (60-69)

60 Acts or occurs
61 Caretakes
62 Consummates activity
63 Consummates activity, failure
64 Disorganizes
65 Disintegrates emotionally
66 Makes music (with)

Control Techniques (70-79)

70 Suggests
71 Request
72 Inhibits
73 Forbids
74 Offers

III Object of Behavioral Clause (4th Digit)

0-8 Same as for 1st digit
9 No information

IV Supplementary Information (5th digit)

0 Ineptly
1 Accompanied by verbalization (or with sound if subject is 1 or 4)
2 Involving interpersonal physical contact

Supplementary Information (cont'd)

3 With intensity
4 In a specified manner, place or time
5 In a manner, place or time other than that specified
6 Imitatively
7 In continuation
8 Complexly
9 No Information

NAME: Behavior-Sanction-Interaction (B-S-I)

DEVELOPER: John Dopyera
Syracuse University
Head Start Evaluation Project
Syracuse, New York

METHOD: Observation: Individual Child Based

SCOPE: S behavior, Teacher behavior, curriculum, physical plant and facilities, S Composition

DATA FORMAT: Codes and verbal descriptions

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Behavior-Sanction-Interaction (B-S-I) was developed as a strategy of program assessment which obviated some of the problems in existing procedures and which reflected a conceptual orientation emphasizing the necessity for obtaining program information for individual children. The term associated with this orientation is micro-environment assessment. Program macro-environment is then induced from the program micro-environments determined for individual children if such is desired.

A major difference between the B-S-I and other program environment assessment procedures concerns the emphasis on sampling encounters the individual child has with his program environment. A target child, in a given setting, is observed on several different days at different times of day. Observation times are determined via a child-observation rotation schedule. Each observation consists of two two-minute periods with time for recording. Observations are recorded on the basis of whether the event is present within the two minute period.

The individual child (one of several in the classroom group to be observed in like manner) is observed for several separate observations and the observations are totaled within categories across time. The minimum number of observations may be as low as twenty for a stable base line but analysis of existent data is not as yet complete relative to this issue.

The major areas of focus include (1) child behavior, (2) environment defined as medium supporting of behavior and (3) environment defined in terms of impingement on child behavior. An additional section indicates problems in the data collection process itself. Other child and setting identification is also included.

The procedure has been used with 70 Head Start children in 10 different classes during the 1968-1969 program year. A minimum of 30 observations on each child was made with the majority of the children having 40 or more observations. Analysis is currently underway regarding interobserver and baseline constancy reliability, program environment, factor structure, and validation in terms of correlating B-S-I factors with cognitive and social-emotional change scores of the sample children

References:

Dopyera, J. Behavior-sanction-interaction: Preliminary Manual. Ditto document, 1969

Dopyera, J. Assessing the micro-environments of Individual Pre-School Children. Final report of Office of Economic Opportunity. Research Contract #4120. Syracuse University Head Start Evaluation and Research Project. 1969.

S NAME ______________________ CTR ______________________ OBSVR ______________________

S CODE # ______________ DATE __________ SEQ # ______________ TIME ______________ / ______________

TEACHER DEFINITION:

CLASS ORGANIZATION

INTCT ____ S CHOI ____
SEP ____ ADULT ____
COMB ____ PARLL ____
SEP-CMB ____ OTHER ____

			LARGE MUSCLE	SMALL MUSCLE	BUILDING	DRAMATIC PLAY	CREATIVE ARTS	WATCH/LISTEN	DISCUSSION	STRUCT LESSON	CLEANUP/SETUP	REST	TOILET/WASH DRESS	EATING	INTERVAL	INTERACTION	UNINVOLVED	
PEERS																		
SUBJECT																		
TEACHER																		
AIDE																		
OTHER ADULT																		
INVOLVEMENT																		
S LOCATION																		
TIME																		
POSTURE																		
TALK																		
CORRECT																		
NOISE/MOTION																		
PERS HARM																		
BOTHER																		
PEER HARM																		
COOPERATION																		
FAIR/SHARE																		
OWNERSHIP																		
SOC AMENITIES																		
LOCATION PROP																		
PROP HARM																		
ORDER/MESS																		
UNIFORMITY																		
WORD-DEED																		
ADULT AUTH																		
__________																		
__________																		

PULL HAIR ____
SCRATCH BODY ____
TAPPING ____
BITE LIP ____
SMILE SET ____

DISTRACTABLE ____
FINGER/MOUTH ____
HAND TO FACE ____
BODY ROCKING ____
STUTTER ____

UNINTELLIGIBLE ____
EXAGGER'TDGAIT ____
LEGS/ARMS ____
ACCIDENT ____
__________ ____

ORIENT ____
LISP ____
YAWN ____
COUGH ____
____ ____

LOCATION
IN: MAIN RM ___
IN:OTHER RM ___
OUT:PREM'S ___
OUT: WLKTRP ___
FLD TRP: IN ___
FLD TRP:OUT ___
OTHER ________

POSTURE	*	**
PRONE		
KNEEL		
SIT		
STAND		
HANG		
BEND		
LEAN		
OTHER		

LOCOMTN	*	**
NONE		
SOME		
RAPID		
MONOLO		
OTHER		

SPPRT BASE	*	**
FLOOR		
GROUND		
FURNTRE		
EQP/UNFXD		
EQP/SMFXD		
EQP/FXD		

COORD	*	**
NONE/REG		
LRG MUSC		
EYE/HAND		
VERBAL		
TIME		
OTHER		

SCOPE	*	**
GLOBAL		
REACTIVE		
SEEK/SCAN		
FOCUS FAR		
FOCUS NR		

ATTENDED	*	**
AROUND		
ADULT		
PEER(S)		
PROP		
OTHER		

PERSIST	*	**
WNDRD/GZD		
INVLD SM		
RECURRNT		
CHNGD FRM		
CHNGD NTO		
OTHER		
PERSON		
WATER		
OTHER		

AFFECT	S	GP
GIGGLE/LAUGH		
SHREIK/YELL		
CRY/SOB		
OUCH		
LOUD TALK		
NO/DNT/STOP!		
SURPRISE		
SMILE		
GRIMACE		
ANGER		
SOC UNACPT WD		
SOC UNACPT BH		
OTHER		

VOC-VERB,NON-AFFCT		
MOUTH SOUNDS		
WORD PRACT		
PHON PRACT		
PROP SOUND IM		
HUM-SNG SPON		
FNTSY (SELF)		
FNTSY (PEER)		
FNTSY (PROP)		
OTHER		

OBSVR QUALIFIERS
S INAUDIBLE ____
S WTCHS OBSVR ____
S RESPONDS TO O ____
OBSVR OVR LOAD ____
S LVS/OBSTRD ____
OBSVTN DISTANCE

	Gp	S	T	I
BIKE				
BIKX				
TRUK				
WAGO				
BLOK				
BLOX				
TOYS				
FRAM				
INTR				
PUZZ				
SWNG				
LGDR				
JNGL				
CARO				
SLID				
COLL				
CRAY				
EASL				
FIPT				
PAIN				
SCIS				
WOOD				
CLAY				
SAND				
WATR				
TOOL				
FOOD				
OTHER				

	Gp	S	T	I
DOLL				
DRES				
HSKP				
TELE				
BUGY				
STOR				
ROPE				
BALL				
RHYM				
DANS				
LETT				
LOTT				
MATH				
SCIE				
SENS				
ANIM				
TABL				
CHRT				
CHBD				
FLBD				
COOK				
PUPP				
BOOK				
MOVI				
RECD				
PERS				
NONE				

TOUCHES

ADULT TO S		S TO ADULT			* PEER TO S		S TO PEER	
				CALLS FOR ATTENTION				
				TELLS WHAT DOING				
				INDICATES WANTS				
				TELLS OTHER TO DO				
				ASKS FOR HELP				
				ASKS PERMISSION				
				ASKS FOR NAME				
				ASKS FOR MEANING				
				ASKS FOR EXPLAN (NON-PERS)				
				ASKS FOR INFORMATION (PERS) (DOING/WANTS)				
				NON-VERBAL +				
				NON-VERBAL -				

NAME:	Center Facilities and Resources Inventory
DEVELOPER:	OEO/H.S. Washington Central Office Staff
METHOD:	Self-report: Questionnaire
SCOPE:	Staff behavior, composition, physical plant and facilities, Administration.
DATA FORMAT:	Ratings, codes
PERSONNEL:	Program

The Center Facilities and Resources Inventory (C AP - HS-52) is a self-report questionnaire which is sent out by the Census Bureau to a broad sample of Head Start agencies including the centers studied in the 1968 National Head Start Evaluation. The center administrator was responsible for completing the questionnaire and returning it to the Evaluation and Research personnel.

The Center Facilities and Resources Inventory contains five parts with several sub-sections in each. Part I asks for information on staff and participants; PartII focuses on children served by the center; Part III deals with space, transportation and other center facilities; Part IV concerns training; Part V asks about program support and center operations.

NAME: Charactistics of Teaching Staff

DEVELOPER: U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation & Research Center
Dr. Caroline Stern, Director

METHOD: Self-Report: Questionnaire/Interview

SCOPE: Teacher/Aide Demographic Charactistics

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-Program Personnel (E & R)

COMMENTS: The Charactistics of Teaching Staff schedule was developed to obtain cross-validation on demographic information about teaching staff in Head Start Centers. Similar information was obtained through self-report questionnaires responded to and mailed to the Census Bureau by Center Personnel. By having Evaluation & Research Center personnel gather similar information it was hoped to check the accuracy of data gained in a completely self-report fashion.

The information was obtained by E & R staff members during the first month of the program year. Subsequently, the information was checked each month (September - June) for continued accuracy. If a new teacher or aide had been added, the new information was recorded.

The information in focus was a potpourri of socio-demographic items concerning socio-economic status, ethnic, sex, education factors, as well as special training received in conjunction with Head Start and prior teaching experience with advantaged and/or disadvantaged children. There was a total of 18 precoded items. Responses were recorded on a separable answer sheet which also included center and teacher identification information.

REFERENCES: U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. Characteristics of Teaching Staff. Mimeographed form, September, 1968.

Also: Codebook for Characteristics of Teaching Staff.

NAME: Checklist of Administrative Variables

DEVELOPER: Shuell Jones
Tulane University
Head Start Evaluation and Research Center
New Orleans, La.

METHOD: Interview: classroom teacher

SCOPE: Administrative Organization

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The checklist of Administrative Variables is a questionnaire of 32 items intended by its developer to record administrative and community variables which directly affect the range of teacher responsibility, the degree of "entrophy" in the Head Start system, and interactions between personnel. The items inquire which of a provided list of personnel fulfilled given specific functions. The items are phrased, "Who________?" and the teacher respondent indicated whether 1. No One; 2. Teacher (self); 3. Center Director; 4. Supervisor; 5. Head Teacher; 6. Social Worker; 7. Parent(s) or Parent's Council; 8. Medical Staff; 9. Other Personnel did the described task.

The questionnaire was designed specifically for use in Head Start program evaluation and is administered to teachers by Evaluation and Research Center personnel following a post-program interview. The checklist items include events that might be expected to occur at some point throughout the Head Start program period.

REFERENCE: Jones, Shuell H. Manual for the Checklist of Administrative Variables. Unpublished Document, September, 1968.

A CHECKLIST OF ADMINISTRATIVE VARIABLES

Indicate the person or persons who did this:

		No One 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Who prepared the publicity which notified parents of a scheduled pre-Head Start Orientation meeting for parents of children eligible for Head Start?									
2.	Who participated in planning the parent orientation meeting program?									
3.	Who recruited prospective Head Start enrollees?									
4.	Who decided on what basis children would be selected for Head Start, if there were more children than available space?									
5.	Please indicate the Head Start personnel directly involved with children whom the parents had the opportunity to meet during the parent orientation meeting.									
6.	Who was involved in structuring the program for the pre-school orientation meeting for teachers?									
7.	Who pointed out the strengths and weaknesses of the Center and program at the teachers' orientation meeting?									
8.	Who identified the philosophy, educational goals and objectives of the Center and program during the teachers' orientation meeting?									
9.	Who was involved in evaluating the pre-school orientation meeting for teachers?									

NAME: Class Facilities and Resources Inventory

DEVELOPER: Caroline Stern
Head Start Evaluation and Research Center
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

METHOD: Mixed: observation and interview (self-report)

SCOPE: Physical plant and facilities; administrative

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Program and non-program

The Class Facilities and Resources Inventory was developed by the staff of U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. It contains two major parts with many items in each part. A supplemental materials list (developed at Temple University) is also used in conjunction with the CFRI.

Part I of the CFRI concerns space, transportation and other center facilities. Part II concerns classroom description. The supplemental list of materials contains a list of specific materials utilized in an experimental context at Temple. The items contained are precoded to the OSCI material codes (see OSCI section) and to the CFRI codes in Part III, section c.

The Class Facilities and Resources Inventory was completed by the Evaluation and Research Center personnel.

REFERENCE: U.C.L.A. Head Start Evaluation and Research Office. Class Facilities and Resources Inventory. Dittoed form, September, 1968.

Also: Code Book for Class Facilities and Resources Inventory. Temple List: Inventory of Supplementary Materials

NAME:	Classroom Behavior Form
DEVELOPER:	Frank Garfunkel School of Education Boston University
METHOD:	Observation: Individual child-based
SCOPE:	S Behavior, teacher behavior, peer composition, physical plant facilities
DATA FORMAT:	Codes, ratings
PERSONNEL:	Non-program

The Classroom Behavior Form (CRB) was developed "as an individual child observation procedure from which to determine data to infer program characteristics."

The CRB consists of eleven separate category items and/or rating scales which are used by an observer every 30 (and/or 15 sec.) for 10 consecutive minutes with the target child.

The categories used are sequence, control, curriculum, process, focus, participation, behavior, style of teacher, interaction, use of materials, and group size.

All recording for 10 minutes on one child is made on a single record sheet.

A preliminary codebook is available but no information on data reduction or analytical procedures was received

A supplementary sheet consists of 7 items each with a 4-point rating scale. The items focus specifically on teacher behavior as it pertained to the child observed. These rating scales are filled out by the observer immediately subsequent to the individual child observation.

REFERENCE: Garfunkel, F. Classroom Behavior Form (CRB):

Instruction for recording behavior of child in classroom situation. Dittoed report, 1968.

8

CRB

Mo.	Day	Year	Cla.	Chil.	Obs.	For

CLASSROOM BEHAVIOUR FORM
(CRB)

Name of Child: ______________________

Name of Teacher: ______________________

Observer: ______________________

Time of Day ____________

Center: ____________

-83a-

TIME	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. SEQUENCE Initiation Termination										
2. CONTROL (1 - 5)	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /
3. CURRICULUM (00-11)										
4. PROCESS FORM (1-5)										
CONTENT (1-5) 5. FOCUS										
6. PARTICIPATION (1-5)										
7. BEHAVIOUR (1-5)										
8. STYLE OF TEACHER (0+1-5)	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /
9. INTERACTION (1. Attention 2. Verbal) (0) None										
CH-ch										
ch-CH										
CH-T										
T-CH										
.0. USE OF MATERIALS (1-5)										
.1. Group Size										

NAME:	Classroom Observation Form
DEVELOPER:	Educational Testing Service Princeton, New Jersey
METHOD:	Composite: Teacher and child based
SCOPE:	Teacher behavior, Subjects behavior, curriculum
DATA FORMAT:	Verbal description: rating scales
PERSONNEL:	Non-program

The Classroom Observation Form was prepared by the Educational Testing Service for use in Project Head Start Evaluation in 1966 but was never actually used. It consists of four pages of items to be completed by an observer including information on classroom activities, critical incidents, specific behaviors, general ratings, and summary recommendations.

An observer, familiar with the items to which he must respond, spends a few minutes in a given class and then begins to fill in sections of the form and to record notes to use as reminders for sections to be written subsequent to the observation. He remains in the classroom for an entire session and records the activity sequence and timing and other pertinent information as it occurs. Upon leaving the classroom he completes the summarization sections and overall ratings.

The process for coding and/or utilizing descriptive portions such as a "brief paragraph summarizing impressions of the teacher" are not specified.

REFERENCE: Educational Testing Service. Classroom Observation Form. Office of Economic Opportunity, Head Start, 1966.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

PROJECT HEAD START EVALUATION -- 1966

Classroom Observation Form

Instructions

Classroom observation for Head Start Evaluation 1966 is extremely important. In a literal sense you are the eyes and ears for the Evaluation team. You are asked to react as an individual to your experiences, but less than a full attempt at objectivity would defeat the purposes of evaluation as well as, ultimately, the purposes of Head Start.

General. When first reporting to a Head Start center for an observation present your credentials to whoever is in charge of the center. Let this person direct you to the proper classroom. Take your time and follow the schedule of the center. After you have been observing for a few minutes and feel comfortable in the classroom, begin to collect answers to the questions on the inside of this form.

Specific. Each of the observation activities has specific instructions stated or implied. You should read over the form carefully before reporting for your first observation.

Fill In The Information Below

Grant No. ☐☐☐☐ Center No. ☐☐☐ Class No. ☐☐

Director of Center ____________________ Date of Visit ____________

Address of Center ____

Teacher's name ____________________ Number of Aides ____________ (helpers in classroom)

Number of Boys ______ Number of Girls ______ General Description of classroom facility and materials: (overall) ____________________

(size of room) ____________________

(condition of room) ____________________

(major materials present in room) ____________________

____

© Copyright 1966 by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. All rights reserved.

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

On this page you are asked to record activities that you see. These may be consecutive or going on at the same time. This should be done as simply and as accurately as you can. In addition, you are asked to record "critical" or memorable incidents of the type you might discuss over coffee with a friend. Attempt to record at least one incident in the "critical" section. In both records be brief but long enough to be clear.

What is going on? (complete while in classroom)

1st activity ______________________ Number participating ______
______________________ Approximate length in minutes ______

2nd activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

3rd activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

4th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

5th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

6th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

7th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

8th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

9th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

10th activity ______________________ No. part. ____ Length ____

Critical or memorable incidents. (complete after leaving classroom but note key words to help remember details)

1. ______________________

2. ______________________

3. ______________________

4. ______________________

Spot Check on Classroom Behaviors

For each activity you have recorded on the opposite page make a tally each time the described behavior below occurs during that activity. When a new activity begins, tally under the number for that activity.

Do you see ---	Activity Number									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a child showing lack of interest in what is going on in the classroom?										
a child making a choice of activities or participation?										
a teacher or aide cuddle or pat or hug a child?										
a child crying or pouting?										
a child told not to talk so much or to stop talking?										
a child encouraged to talk or to continue and expand a story or idea?										
a child joining an activity that another child has begun?										
a child yawning or resting when it is not rest period?										
a child laughing out loud?										
a child hitting another child?										
a teacher (or aide) reading aloud to a student(s)?										
a child interrupted by the teacher or aide when he is speaking?										
List other significant behaviors and tally if desired	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Each of the descriptions below can only be answered after you have completed your entire observation. Please decide on a yes or no answer or indicate why you have not done so.

Did you see ---

teacher and children plan and complete some activity?
yes no ______________________

periods of time when no one seemed to know what to do?
yes no ______________________

attention to isolated children?
yes no ______________________

the teacher use sarcasm or ridicule in talking to children?
yes no ______________________

children who did not talk to anyone as far as you noticed?
yes no ______________________

opportunities for children to speak before whole group or small group of other children?
yes no ______________________

a classroom that could be described as apathetic?
yes no ______________________

a classroom that could be described as exhilarated or excited?
yes no ______________________

evidence that each child felt accepted in the class?
yes no ______________________

a teacher punish a child or the class with words or actions?
yes no ______________________

children talking to each other spontaneously and often?
yes no ______________________

teacher or aide spending long periods talking, telling, directing the children while the children said nothing much?
yes no ______________________

(space to add own description)

This page should be completed after your visit to the Center.

Assuming that anything can be improved no matter how it rates at present, if you had to improve this particular Head Start Class, what would you recommend?

Possible areas

Emotional Environment

Organization and Structure

Content and activities

Write a brief paragraph summarizing your impressions of the teacher of this class. Mention both strengths and weaknesses -- as far as you can tell from a brief visit.

Summative rating scales. Rank this class on the following scales. Use an X.

General emotional climate

highly supportive	generally supportive	neither supportive nor unsupportive	generally unsupportive	highly unsupportive

General organization of activities

highly structured	generally structured	about equally structured-unstructured	generally unstructured	highly unstructured

General content of activities

highly stress informational aspects	generally stress informational aspects	about equally informational and playful	generally stress playful aspects	highly stress playful aspects

Final comments or additions to summarize observation.

your signature

NAME: Class Room Register

DEVELOPER: OEO/H.S. Washington Central Office Staff

METHOD: Self-report: Inventory

SCOPE: Composition, identification

DATA FORMAT: Verbal Description, measurement, codes.

PERSONNEL: Program (adm. and/or teacher)

DESCRIPTION: The classroom register seeks basic enrollment data including total number of children in class, dates of starting and closing, a list of children's names, addresses, birth dates, and names of persons with whom children reside.

1a. Grant No.

1b. Center No.

1c. Class No.

2. Center name

3. Street or post office box

4. Post office, State, ZIP code

5. Number of children in class

6a. Center starting date

6b. Center closing date

CAP-HS Form 35(NS)
(9-14-67)

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
PROJECT HEAD START

CLASS REGISTER

Return the duplicate copy of this form immediately after registration to:

PROJECT HEAD START
CENSUS OPERATIONS OFFICE
1201 EAST 10th STREET
JEFFERSONVILLE, INDIANA 47130

INSTRUCTIONS – Complete in duplicate for each class in your Head Start Center.

Item 1a and 1b – Enter the Grant and Center numbers. These should be obtained from the label attached to the Center Director's letter. (Boxes 1 and 2)

Item 1c – Assign a two digit number for each class at the center beginning with "01."

Items 2-3-4 – Complete Center name, address, and ZIP code.

Item 5 – Number of children currently registered in this class.

Item 6 – Center starting and closing dates.

Column (b) – List alphabetically all children currently registered.

Column (c) through (f) – Complete for each child.

The child's identification number consists of the grant number, center number, class number, and child number (column (a)). Keep the original form for your records adding late registrants in this class to the next available line.

Child number (a)	Child's name *(Last name, first name, middle initial)* (b)	Number and street or post office box number (c)	City and ZIP code (d)	Date of birth *(Month, day, year)* (e)	Name of person with whom child resides (f)
01					
02					
03					
04					
05					
06					
07					
08					
09					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

TEACHER'S NAME

DATE

This paper has been chemically treated – it is not necessary to use carbon paper for duplicate copies

NAME: Cognitive Stimulation Coding Categories - CSCC

DEVELOPER: Carla F. Berry (with Virginia Shipman and Robert Hess)
Chicago Institute of Early Childhood Education
1525 E. 53rd Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

METHOD: Observation: Teacher-based

SCOPE: Teacher (verbal) behavior; curricular; student composition

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-program (trained)

ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION:

The Cognitive Stimulation Coding Categories - CSCC- was developed to assess preschool teachers' speech, especially as it may act as a stimulant for cognitive development. All of the teacher's speech is noted and coded but the code selects and gives emphasis to those aspects of speech considered to have cognitive stimulating qualities. The category system has been based on previous research findings of Hess and Shipman (1965) on maternal teaching styles.

The basic unit in the coding process is the "grammatic message unit" based on the aural meaning of one or more connected sentences or sentence fragments. Each of these units is assigned three code designations for (1) context, (2) participants, (3) content. The context code specifies the activity taking place while the verbal behavior occurs. It is based on the UCLA Classroom Observation Schedule. Participant's code refers to the number of children with whom the teacher is interacting. Content refers to the coding of the actual verbal behavior. This latter area includes codings for 53 possible categories which are topically subsumed as (a) precursor:teacher alerts and directs child attention to facilitate learning and performance, (b) regulatory: teacher exerts simple direct control, (c) cognitive, (d) mixed content.

Berry (1969) reported the CSCC categories as analyzed by Multivariate Analysis of Variance technique to differentiate between preschool teachers in differing kinds of programs (permissive child-centered Montessori, eclectic) for certain clusters of items including (1) control items and positive and negative feeling tone summaries, (2) cognitive items. Although the way in which cognitively oriented speech and control speech was expressed did differentiate between teachers, the data obtained on child's activity or number of participants did not. Berry et. al. also reported an intercoder reliability of .82 in connection with this study.

REFERENCES:

Berry, Carla F., Shipman, Virginia C. and Hess, R.D. An analysis of preschool teachers' speech styles using the cognitive stimulation coding categories (CSCC). Paper presented at AERA, 1969.

Hess, R.D. and Shipman, Virginia C. Early experience and the specialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 26, 4.

NAME: Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior

DEVELOPER: Harold Anderson

METHOD: Observation, teacher-based

SCOPE: Teacher Behavior

DATA FORMAT: Codes/tallies

PERSONNEL: Non-program

COMMENTS:

The Dominative and Socially Integrative Behavior Scales were developed to obtain a record of the frequency and nature of the teachers' contacts with the children in a classroom group. Domination was considered the use of force, threats, blame, etc. to make another behave according to one's own standards or purposes. Integrative behavior,on the other hand, referred to "behavior leading to a oneness or commoness of purpose among differences", "noncoercive", "open to new data", etc.

Five minute observations were recorded on a blank which listed childrens' names on the tops of vertical columns and categories for teachers' contacts on horizontal columns. Along with the childrens' names were two other listings: Group, for instances when teacher contacts were not directed to specific children and Unidentified, when intended recipient of a teacher initiative was uncertain.

The first eight categories were designed to record dominative contacts which included (1) determines a detail of activity or acts for the child in carrying out a detail, (2) direct refusal to a request, (3) relocating, reseating, or placing children in different relations to each other or to property,(4) postponing or slowing of the child, (5) disapproving, blaming, obstructing; (6) warning, threats, or conditional promise, (7) Call to attention or to group activity, (8) rations material. Two categories were considered neither dominative or integrative: Lecture method: teacher defines a problem or anticipates a question and gives the answer and question: teacher asks a question for which there is a predetermined correct answer. The following nine categories were considered integrative: (1) perfunctory question or statement, (2) approval, (3) accepts difference (4) extends invitation to activity, (5) question or statement regarding child's expressed interest or activity, (6) build-up - includes helping child arrive at better definition of problem or solution without supplying final answer, (7) participates in joint activity with children, (8) sympathy, (9) permission.

The observers attempted to record at the appropriate place on the blank every "contact" which the teacher had with an individual child or group during the five minute observation period.

Reliabilities were determined for observation by child and by categories and correlations were reported to be sufficiently high (.78 and .77) to make data acceptable as measures of teacher behavior (Anderson, 1939). The observers showed high agreement in defining a contact and in recording the total number of contacts. They were more reliable in observing dominative contacts than integrative contacts.

In a study of three Kindergarten groups in two schools (Anderson, 1939) differences were noted between teachers in proportion of dominative vs. integrative contacts and in total number of individual contacts. In several hours of observation some children had almost no individual contacts while others averaged as high as 55 contacts per hour.

REFERENCE:

Anderson, Harold. The measurement of dominative and of socially integrative behavior in teachers' contacts with children. Child Development, 1939, 10, 73-89.

NAME: Integrated Individual Observation Schedule (II OS)

DEVELOPER: John Dopyera, David Lindstrom, Linda Hollingshead
Syracuse University
Head Start Evaluation Project
Syracuse, New York

METHOD: Observation: Individual child based

SCOPE: S behavior, teacher/aide behavior,curriculum
physical plant/facilities, peer composition

DATA FORMAT: Codes, tallies, ratings

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Integrated Individual Observation Schedule (II OS) was developed in an effort to demonstrate that common time spent in observing individual children could be coded in multiple ways. It was developed and field tested during the summer of 1968 at Syracuse by Dopyera, Lindstrom, and Hollingshead.

The IIOS combines some of the codes of the SIOS, the unrevised OSCI, the OSOD (CRB), and a Praise-Blame tally (each is described separately in this report) into a two minute individual child observation format. The codes are the same as those indicated in the codebooks for the separate procedures.

The observer locates the target child, observes him in SIOS style - that is, records verbal and non-verbal interactions (initiations and responses) between the child and others for 12 ten-second periods. Subsequent to each two minute recording, the observer records what has just occurred according to the OSCI codes, (context, content, and materials). If the child had been reinforced in any way during the two minute period, this was also noted as a praise or blame tally.

The IIOS was used in field settings (summer Head Start classes) by observers familiar with both the OSCI and SIOS codes to determine if its use were feasible. It was determined that the procedures could be used effectively to generate both interaction and content data on an individual child. No systematic data collection and/or reliability check were undertaken and no data reduction techniques were developed.

REFERENCE:

Dopyera, J.D., Lindstrom, D., Hollingshead, L. *Manual for Integrated Individual Observation Schedule.* Dittoed document, 1968.

INTEGRATED INDIVIDUAL OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

center	observer	date	A_1	A_2	A_N
		/ /	sex	eth	eth

child no. | letter | eth sex | time | OSCI content-content | OSOD process focus

adult intervention | OSCI teacher involve | OSOD child participatio

V | OSOD Locus of control

materials used

N | praise-blame tally

praise-blame

child no. | letter | eth sex | time | OSCI content-content | OSOD process focus

adult intervention | OSCI teacher involve | OSOD child participatio

V | OSOD locus of control

materials used

N | praise-blame tally

praise-blame

child no. | letter | eth sex | time | OSCI content-content | OSOD process focus

adult intervention | OSCI teacher involve | OSOD child participatio

V | OSOD locus of control

materials used

N | praise-blame tally

praise-blame

NAME:	Location Activity Material Inventory (LAMI)
DEVELOPER:	Harold Wilensky c/o Institute for Developmental Studies New York University New York, New York
METHOD:	Observation: Individual Child Based
SCOPE:	S behavior, physical plant and facilities, peer composition
DATA FORMAT:	Codes, tallies, rating scale
PERSONNEL:	Non-program.

The Location Activity Material Inventory was designed to provide a description of child activity during play periods. Four dimensions included are (a) geographical location in classroom, (b) equipment used, (c) social contacts, (d) type and intensity of motor activity.

Locations are recorded in categories corresponding to designations made by the educational staff in the settings for which the procedure was designed and would not be necessarily appropriate for other programs. The equipment use was coded into 19 categories including books, manipulative toys, household and kitchen toys, telephone, science toys musical instruments alphabet board, etc. The child's interaction was coded as occurring with either teacher or children or as none. Activity level was coded into one of five categories ranging from no overt movement to locomotion involving a high expenditure of energy.

Cohen's coefficient of agreement for nominal scales, interpreted as the proportion of joint judgment in which there is agreement, were reported as .95, .96, .86; .77 respectively for each of the dimensions listed above.

In comparative study of four IDS classes, Wilensky reported findings including (a) some differences of frequency of use of location varying with the physical characteristics of the classrooms,

(b) change over program year in frequency of use of different materials, (c) differences between classes in amount of social interaction, (d) increased social interaction across program year, (e) more teacher time spent with brighter children (sig. for two of four classes), (f) differences between classes in activity level.

REFERENCES:

Institute for Developmental Studies. *Interim Progress Report. Part II. Research and Evaluation*. Unpublished document, IDS, New York University, 1968.

Wilensky, H. *Observational Techniques in Preschool Classrooms*. Unpublished document, Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966.

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

LOCATION ACTIVITY MATERIAL INVENTORY (LAMI)

Obs.____________________ Date____________

School__________

Materials

e.g.- BO, MT, A, HH, TA, W, TR, DO, F, BL, RE, CL

Loc.

1. Book C.
2. Tables
3. Sink-Easel
4. Doll C.
5. Shelves
6. Open Area

Soc.

O = alone
T = tchr
C = child

Name	Loc.	Mat.	a	Soc.	m.

a) Column for second material

NAME: Medical/Dental Information

DEVELOPER: OEO/H.S. Washington Central Office

METHOD: Self-report: Questionnaire

SCOPE: Curriculum: medical

DATA FORMAT: Checks and codes

PERSONNEL: Program/medical staff

DESCRIPTION: The medical/dental information form was developed as a procedure for recording medical contacts the Head Start child had during the program.

The Form is divided into five (5) sections. These are: Identification, Immunizations, Screening tests, Dental care, and Medical care.

The Medical/Dental Information Form is the only "program" procedure found which includes potential influences at a direct psychological level.

Budget Bureau No. 116-R0105 Approval Expires August 31, 1968

CAP-HS Form 31
(12-5-67)

OFFICE OF ECOMONIC OPPORTUNITY
PROJECT HEAD START

MEDICAL/DENTAL INFORMATION

IDENTIFICATION

Grant No.	Center No.	Class No.	Child No.	OFFICE USE ONLY			
				a	b	c	d

1. Child's name	Last, first, middle initial, Jr., Sr., etc.			
2. Child's address	Number and street or RFD			
	City	County	State	ZIP code
3. Date of birth	Month	Day	Year	
4. Sex of child	1 ☐ Male	2 ☐ Female		
5. Ethnic/Racial group of this child	a. Caucasian 1 ☐ Mexican-American 2 ☐ Puerto Rican 3 ☐ Other Caucasian	b. 4 ☐ Negro c. 5 ☐ American Indian d. 6 ☐ Oriental	e. 7 ☐ Eskimo f. 8 ☐ Polynesian g. 9 ☐ Other	
6. Date of this report	Month	Day	Year	

IMMUNIZATIONS

7. DPT (Diphtheria, Pertussis, Tetanus)

a. Before the beginning of the current Head Start Health Program, this child:

1 ☐ Had never been immunized for DPT
2 ☐ Had received at least one dose but not fully immunized
3 ☐ Was fully immunized for DPT (had at least 3 doses of vaccine, the most recent within the past two years)
4 ☐ Had unknown DPT immunization status

b. At the time of this report, how many doses of DPT vaccine had this child received during the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ None
2 ☐ One
3 ☐ Two
4 ☐ Three or more
5 ☐ Unknown or unrecorded

c. At the time of this report, this child:

1 ☐ Has never been immunized for DPT
2 ☐ Has received at least one dose of DPT but is not fully immunized
3 ☐ Is fully immunized for DPT
4 ☐ Has unknown DPT immunization status

8. POLIOMYELITIS

a. Before the beginning of the current Head Start Health Program, this child:

1 ☐ Had never been immunized for polio
2 ☐ Had received at least one dose of polio vaccine, but was not fully immunized
3 ☐ Was fully immunized for polio (had received at least 3 doses of trivalent oral polio vaccine, the most recent within two years; or had received three doses of monovalent oral polio vaccine, plus one dose of trivalent oral polio vaccine, the most recent within two years)
4 ☐ Had unknown polio immunization status

b. At the time of this report, how many doses of oral polio vaccine had this child received during the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ None
2 ☐ One
3 ☐ Two or more
4 ☐ Unknown or unrecorded

c. At the time of this report, this child:

1 ☐ Has never been immunized for polio
2 ☐ Has received at least one dose, but not fully immunized
3 ☐ Is fully immunized for polio
4 ☐ Has unknown immunization status for polio

IMMUNIZATIONS – Continued

9. SMALLPOX

At time of this report, had this child received a smallpox vaccination during the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ No, because of recent vaccination
3 ☐ Yes, because he had not recently been vaccinated
4 ☐ Yes, because he had never previously been vaccinated
5 ☐ Immunization status unknown or unrecorded

10. MEASLES

At time of this report, had this child received measles vaccine during the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ No, because he had already had measles vaccine
3 ☐ No, because he had already had measles
4 ☐ Yes
5 ☐ Measles immunization status unknown or unrecorded

SCREENING TESTS

11. HEIGHT AND WEIGHT MEASUREMENTS

a. At beginning of program –

Date of measurement ____________________

Height . . . . (________cm.) ________ ins.

Weight . . . . (________kg.) ________ lbs.

b. At time of this report (if measured)

Date of measurement ____________________

Height . . . . (________cm.) ________ ins.

Weight . . . . (________kg.) ________ lbs.

12. TUBERCULIN TEST

a. At the time of this report, had this child received a Tuberculin Test as part of the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No
3 ☐ Unknown or unrecorded

b. If Yes,

1 ☐ Result positive
2 ☐ Result negative
3 ☐ Result unknown

c. If No,

1 ☐ Because child had positive test in the past.
2 ☐ Because child had recent negative test.
3 ☐ Because of other reasons.

d. If the Tuberculin Test, past or present, was positive, this child:

1 ☐ Has had no further evaluation or treatment.
2 ☐ Is currently being evaluated for Tuberculosis
3 ☐ Has been fully evaluated and found not to require treatment
4 ☐ Is receiving treatment
5 ☐ Treatment completed
6 ☐ Requires treatment, but not receiving it
7 ☐ Has unknown follow-up status

13. BLOOD TEST FOR ANEMIA

a. At time of this report, had this child received a blood test for anemia as part of the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes, result normal
3 ☐ Yes, result indicates anemia
4 ☐ Not known or record unclear

b. Exact result of screening test for anemia *(Answer as many as available)*

Hemoglobin, in grams/100 ml . . . . ____________

Hemoglobin, in percent . . . . ____________ %

Hematocrit, in percent volume
Packed cells . . . . ____________ %

1 ☐ Exact result not recorded or unknown

c. If screening test indicated anemia, this child:

1 ☐ Has had no further evaluation or treatment
2 ☐ Is currently being evaluated
3 ☐ Has been fully evaluated and found not to require treatment
4 ☐ Is receiving treatment
5 ☐ Treatment completed
6 ☐ Fully evaluated and found to need treatment, but not receiving treatment
7 ☐ Has unknown follow-up status

14. HEARING SCREENING TEST

a. At time of this report, had this child received a test of hearing as part of the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes, result normal
3 ☐ Yes, result abnormal
4 ☐ Yes, child "not testable"
5 ☐ Not known or record unclear

b. If result of test was abnormal, this child:

1 ☐ Has had no further evaluation or treatment
2 ☐ Has been retested and found normal
3 ☐ Has been scheduled for evaluation
4 ☐ Has been fully evaluated and is receiving treatment
5 ☐ Treatment completed
6 ☐ Fully evaluated and scheduled for treatment
7 ☐ Has been recommended for evaluation or treatment but no facilities are available
8 ☐ Has been fully evaluated but no plans for treatment
9 ☐ Has unknown follow-up status

SCREENING TESTS – Continued

. VISION SCREENING TEST

a. At the time of this report, had this child received a test of visual acuity as part of the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes, result normal
3 ☐ Yes, result abnormal
4 ☐ Yes, child "not testable"
5 ☐ Not known or record unclear

15b. If result of test was abnormal, this child:

1 ☐ Has had no further evaluation or treatment
2 ☐ Has been retested and found to be normal
3 ☐ Has been fully evaluated and requires no eyeglasses
4 ☐ Has been found to require eyeglasses but not yet wearing them
5 ☐ Has had eyeglasses prescribed and fitted and is wearing them
6 ☐ Has unknown follow-up status

DENTAL CARE

16a. At the time of this report, did this child have a dental examination as part of the current Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes, by a dentist
3 ☐ Yes, by a dental hygienist
4 ☐ Yes, by a physician
5 ☐ Yes, by someone other than dentist, hygienist or physician
6 ☐ Not known or record unclear

b. If yes, on dental examination, this child was found to have:

1 ☐ No dental disease
2 ☐ Dental caries (decay, cavities)
3 ☐ Other dental disease
4 ☐ Dental caries and other dental disease

c. If dental caries were found, how many teeth were affected?

1 ☐ None
2 ☐ One or more, give exact number, if possible. Number of teeth . . . . ____________
3 ☐ Not known or record unclear

17a. Does this child routinely drink flouridated water?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes
3 ☐ Uncertain or unknown

b. Did this child have flouride applied to his teeth as part of the current Head Start Dental Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes
3 ☐ Not known or record unclear

18. At the time of this report, this child:

1 ☐ Has had no dental treatment recommended
2 ☐ Has completed all recommended dental treatment
3 ☐ Is currently receiving dental treatment
4 ☐ Is not receiving dental treatment because no treatment facility is available
5 ☐ Is not receiving recommended dental treatment for any other reason
6 ☐ Has unknown recommendation status
7 ☐ Has unknown treatment status

MEDICAL CARE

19a. Did this child require medical care for an acute illness or injury during the current Head Start Program?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes, an acute illness
3 ☐ Yes, an accident or injury
4 ☐ Yes, both an illness and accident or injury
5 ☐ Not known or record unclear

b. If "yes," was medical care provided by the Head Start Health Program?

1 ☐ Yes, for an acute illness
2 ☐ Yes, for an accident or injury
3 ☐ Yes, for both an acute illness and an accident or injury
4 ☐ No, medical care was not provided

20a. Did this child have any medical or psychological problem during the current Head Start Health Program which required or still requires treatment or special evaluation beyond the original examination?

(Do not include acute brief illness and injury noted in question 19, or anemia, vision problem, hearing problem, dental problem, or positive tuberculin test noted in questions 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16)

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes
3 ☐ Not known or record unclear

20b. If yes, which of the following conditions was present? *(Check each condition which required treatment, further evaluation or other special follow-up, then answer the questions on the following page for each condition checked)*

Code
A ☐ Behavior problem or psychiatric condition
B ☐ Learning problem or mental retardation
C ☐ Convulsive disorder (siezures, epilepsy)
D ☐ Cerebral dysfunction, including cerebral palsy ("brain injury")
E ☐ Skin disease, including impetigo and eczema
F ☐ Bronchial asthma
G ☐ Hay fever or alergic rhinitis
H ☐ Other chronic respiratory disease, sinusitis, bronchitis
I ☐ Heart murmer requiring specialist consultation
J ☐ Definite heart disease
K ☐ Umbilical hernia
L ☐ Inguinal or fermoral hernia
M ☐ Tonsil and adenoid disease
N ☐ Phimosis (circumcision recommended)
O ☐ Enuresis (bed wetting)
P ☐ Other urinary tract disease, infections anomalies, etc.
Q ☐ Speech disorder
R ☐ Orthopedic condition
S ☐ All other conditions

For each condition checked in question 20b, put the code letter in the space at the top of one of the columns and check one box in each of the four sections in the column below the code letter.

CODE LETTER →										
1. SEVERITY OF CONDITION **Severe** – Will certainly interfere with future health, school performance or school adjustment if not treated	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Moderate – Is likely to interfere with future health, performance or adjustment if not treated	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mild – Is unlikely to interfere with future health, performance or adjustment if not treated	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Severity not estimated	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2. PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE AND TREATMENT Newly discovered in current Head Start Program	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Previously known, but not receiving adequate evaluation or treatment outside of Head Start Program	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Previously known, and now receiving adequate evaluation or treatment outside of Head Start Program	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Previously known, and all treatment completed outside of Head Start Program	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Previously known, but status unrecorded	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3. STATUS OF EVALUATION OR FOLLOW-UP IN THE CURRENT HEAD START PROGRAM Recommended evaluation completed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Evaluation in progress but not completed	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Evaluation planned and scheduled but not yet taking place	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Recommended evaluation not available because of lack of appropriate facility	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Recommended evaluation not yet planned or scheduled	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Evaluation status unknown	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
4. STATUS OF TREATMENT IN THE CURRENT HEAD START PROGRAM Recommended treatment completed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Currently receiving treatment	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Treatment planned and scheduled but not yet taking place	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Recommended treatment not yet available because of lack of appropriate facility	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Recommended treatment not yet planned or scheduled	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Treatment status unknown	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

Diagnosis *(Give the exact diagnosis, if known, and identify with the code letter)*

NAME: Mueller (No name indicated)

DEVELOPER: Joseph F. Mueller
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

METHOD: Observation: Teacher-based

SCOPE: Teacher (Verbal - non-verbal)

DATA FORMAT: Category Codes & Ratings

PERSONNEL: Non-program (trained)

ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION:

Four discrete measures - Cognitive Demand, Prop Setting Bungles, Activity-Language Bungles, Impeding Discovery were developed by Joseph Mueller to assess preschool teachers' behavior as exhibited on video tapes of directed lessons.

Cognitive Demand refers to those behaviors which require children to become involved in a thinking process. Observers focused on teachers' questions, requests, directions and demands and coded them as Too Low, Too High, Simple Response - Present, Simple Response - Not Present, Demonstration with Interpretation, Knowledge-Present, Knowledge-Not Present, or Knowledge Plus. Categories were assigned numerical value in which Too High and Too Low received 0, Simple Responses-Present and Simple Responses-Not Present received 1, Demonstrations with Interpretation and Knowledge Present received 2, etc. The weighted scores were then added and divided by the total number of minutes of the lesson for a composite Cognitive Demand score for the given lesson.

The second measure Prop Bungles assessed extent of lack of planning, awareness, or judgment on part of the teacher in the manner she uses materials, props and/or setting. Examples of prop bungles would include initiating activity in a room too small for that activity. Frequency of bungles were scored per lesson, weighted by multiplying by the length of the average lesson, and divided by the time in minutes of the lesson being condidered.

management and selection of activities during the lesson. Inappropriate pacing, asking a question without allowing an answer, promising an activity that never happens were considered activity bungles. Language bungles included improper phrasing of a question, calling child by wrong name. A score was given to each observed bungle. If bungle continued then through a count of 10 (or thereafter 5) an additional score was recorded to a total of 5 scores for any one bungle. The weighted scores were determined in the same manner as for Prop Bungles.

A fourth count was made of Impeding Discovery. This referred to acts and statements of a teacher that could interfere with discovery such as giving a child a precise model for drawing a figure, answering questions posed by the lesson material herself, stopping a child from exploring. The weighted scores were determined as above.

The categories for analysis of the video tapes were derived from repeated viewings prior to actual scoring. No inter-rater reliability was reported.

Mueller reported that in a study of a series of tapes prepared of six student teachers of preschool children, Cognitive Demand Scores were significantly correlated with a measure of Appropriate Behavior and Involvement. Prop Setting Bungles were significantly correlated with a measure of Task Deviancy while Language-Activity Bungles were significantly related to Non-Involvement. Scores on Impeding Discovery were negatively correlated with Total Appropriate Behavior. These findings were cited as evidence of ways in which teacher's behavior affects behavior of children in this kind of structured lesson situation.

REFERENCE:

Mueller, J.F. Exploratory study of the psychological ecology of a directed lesson in a nursery school setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1968.

Reel #______ Sheet #____

Cognitive Demand	Teachers A	B	C	D	E	F
TOO LOW No challenge. Teacher answers own Question. Naming very common object, like a ball						
SIMPLE RESPONSE PRESENT Teacher requires simple response about something present. Requires physical movement, like placing object or naming object. Demonstration without interpretation.						
SIMPLE RESPONSE NOT PRESENT Requires simple response about something not present or abstract						
DEMONSTRATION WITH INTERPRETATION						
KNOWLEDGE PRESENT Teacher requires verbal interpretation or description. Prediction of present events.						
KNOWLEDGE NOT PRESENT Teacher requires verbal interpretation or description of something not present						
KNOWLEDGE PLUS Reflective question. Reflective interpretation. Analysis or synthesis which requires high demand.						
TOO HIGH Doesn't follow logical sequence. Vocabulary too difficult						

Reel #_____ Sheet #_____

Bungles	Teachers					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
PROP BUNGLES						
Too big to handle or too small to handle or see.						
Interferes with purpose of lesson.						
Too stimulating or too many props.						
Unnecessary or unused in lesson.						
Introduced at too slow or fast a rate.						
Takes away a good learning prop.						
Holds prop away from children.						
Leaves room to get forgotten prop.						
Prop interferes with vision.						
Prop interferes with movement of lesson.						
Uses prop inappropriately like book upside down.						
ACTIVITY BUNGLES						
Stimulatesactivity contrary to purpose.						
Introduces activities at too slow or too fast a rate.						
Starts activity and doesn't complete.						
Ignores or desists appropriate behavior.						
Promises activity that doesn't happen.						
Teacher fails to conclude lesson.						
Provides no transition activity.						
Chooses activity where teacher is doer.						
Teacher demands uniform behavior before starting without apparent reason.						
Teacher allows activity to continue without direction which is not in line with lesson.						
Repetition of some demand or question.						
Asks question and doesn't allow time for children to answer.						
Answers own question.						
SETTING BUNGLES						
Not enough room for activity scheduled.						
Teacher assumes inappropriate stance.						
Activity not suited for room.						
LANGUAGE BUNGLES						
Uses language too difficult or too vague.						
Calls child by wrong name.						

Reel # ______ Sheet # ______

Impeding Discovery	Teacher: ------	------	------	------	------	------
Things that teachers do that interfere with discovery. Examples: Teacher makes project for child. Teacher tells them what they are going to make. Teacher demonstrates task to children. Tells them specifically what to do. Asks a child what he is making. Has child demonstrate what he is making. Calls other children's attention to what a child is making. Teacher stops exploratory behavior. Provides solutions to children's problems. Tells children what the reaction or solution is or what the result will be. Teacher asks children what they would like to do and then tells them what to do. Teacher makes something else out of child's product. Teacher answers own questions. Teacher provides props that can't be explored. Teacher keeps props away from children.						

NAME: Observation of Substantive Curricular Input (OSCI)

DEVELOPERS: Dr. Carolyn Stern and associates
Head Start Evaluation and Research Center
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

METHOD:

SCOPE: Teacher behavior; children's behavior; curriculum; physical plant and facilities.

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The observation of Substantive Curricular Input (OSCI) was developed at the University of California, Los Angeles under the direction of Dr. Carolyn Stern as a procedure for determining curricular components of a preschool setting. The OSCI was used during the 1967 - 68 National Head Start Evaluation in a preliminary form and was revised and included in the 1968 - 1969 National Evaluation. This latter format is the one focused upon in this discussion.

The OSCI procedure requires that records be made for 10 three minute segments in each observational unit. Four units (two hours) are completed in each observation day. Two observers may be used if the class separates; the separate but simultaneous observations are, however, combined subsequently into one record.

The observer's focus in the 10 three minute segments shifts between the class (children and the activities in which they are involved) and adults (teacher, aide, other adult) in the following sequence: head teacher, class, class; aide or other adult, randomly determined, class, class; other adult, randomly determined, class, class.

When the class is in focus the observer indicates the number of children in the total and/or subgroups, recording from the largest to the smallest group to individual children. The observer also uses three sets of codes - a context code, a content code, and a materials code to identify the activity as well as indicate the nature of the relationship, if any, between the group and any adult present. Also recorded is the total number of subjects present during the recording and whether the setting is inside or outside.

When an adult (head teacher, aide, or some other adult) is in focus an observation is made/recorded every 20 seconds (9 in 3 minutes). The same context, content and materials codes referred to in observation of the class are used for recording the adult phase plus a teacher locus of control scale and a teacher involvement scale. The size of the group the teacher is working with is also recorded.

The emphasis in the OSCI is on documenting the activities (curriculum) and how the activities are functioning for the participants. Therefore, it is not possible to retrieve data on any given child. The record, while observationally based in what children are doing and numerically with whom, provides information only on activities present during the time the classroom was observed. Whether a given child encountered a given activity or in what way he encountered it, cannot be determined from the OSCI record. Although Dr. Stern has indicated that an individual child OSCI was being developed, the writers have not yet seen it.

It might be noted that the IIOS (described elsewhere in this report) represents an effort to use OSCI codes in conjunction with two other coding sets (SIO/P.B.) with an individual child. This format was field tested and found to be adequate (with observers previously trained in both the SIO and OSCI) although the procedure was never used to systematically collect data for groups of children. The OSCI context codes were also used in the BSI procedures described elsewhere in this report.

REFERENCES

Stern, C. Observation of Substantive Curricular Input: Manual. UCLA Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, August, 1968.

Also: Definitions of Codes
Codebook for Keypunching
Procedure for Hand Analysis of Data

OBSERVATION OF SUBSTANTIVE CURRICULAR INPUT (OSCI), REVISED, JULY 15, 1968 PAGE 1

E & R	YR.	SITE	CLASS		GROUP	MONTH	DAY	TEAM	TIME
	9			E					

T_1______

T_{x1}______

T_{x2}______

AIDE ______

OTHER

ADULTS ______

T_1	T_{x1}	T_{x2}	T_{x3}	T_{x4}

A_1 (T_1)	B_1 (CLASS)	B_2 (CLASS)	C_1 (T_x)	B_3 (CLASS)
DOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR
			20	
			40	
			60	
			20	
			40	
			60	
			20	
			40	
			60	

TOTAL CHILDREN PRESENT ______

TOTAL CHILDREN PRESENT ______

TOTAL CHILDREN PRESENT ______

ME BEGUN______

OSCI REVISED JULY 15, 1968

B_4 (CLASS)	A_2 (T_1)	B_5 (CLASS)	B_6 (CLASS)	C_2 (T_x)
OUR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR	INDOOR C OUTDOOR
	20			20
	40			40
	60			60
	20			20
	40			40
	60			60
	20			20
	40			40
	60			60

AL CHILDREN
SENT ____

TOTAL CHILDREN
PRESENT ____

TOTAL CHILDREN
PRESENT ____

TIME ENDED____

NAME: Observer Rating Form (ORF)

DEVELOPER: John Pierce-Jones, William Caldwell, Emma Lou Lynn,
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

METHOD: Observation: Teacher-based

SCOPE: Teacher Behavior

DATA FORMAT: Ratings

PERSONNEL: Non-program (trained)

The Observer Rating Form (ORF) was developed at the University of Texas during 1965 - 66 under the direction of John Pierce-Jones. The procedure was used extensively within Texas, and subsequent to a reanalysis including item reduction, the ORF was adopted for use in the 1966-67 National Head Start Evaluation effort. It was also used during the 1967-68 National Head Start Evaluation by selected Evaluation and Research Centers.

The long form of the ORF consists of 48 items which have a prime focus on the teacher. The item formats, with a few exceptions, are seven point-rating scales. The few exceptions break this pattern with either a similar rating response to be recorded with a 5 point scale, or by changing the response format to non-continuous categories, e.g., type of punishment used.

The short form consists of 25 items from the longer list which are more consistent with regard to the response format.

A manual for users is available which includes both general instructions for use and explanations, including examples, for each item.

Observers spend approximately 2 1/2 hours in a class making notes and tallies. They then leave the class and immediately record impressions with the rating scale.

An obvious limitation of the ORF is that it appears most suited for observing in structured settings. For example, the items frequently require hearing the teacher's comments to children although in many child development-oriented programs it isn't possible to hear much of what the teacher is saying to children.

Early analysis of ORF data suggest that ratings do relate to child change scores on the Stanford-Binet. Six factors emerged from analysis of the 1966-67 evaluation data which collectively "accounted for" 50% of the Stanford-Binet change in the sample children. The three factors which accounted for the greatest (collective) variance (30%) were labeled "academic orientation" (14.3%), "non-punitiveness" (3%), and "social development techniques" (13.2%).

REFERENCES:

Pierce-Jones, J., Caldwell, W., Lynn, E.L. Observer Rating Form. University of Texas

Also: ORF Supplementary Sheet.

PROJECT HEADSTART CENTER OBSERVER"S RATING FORM

CENTER NO.____________________ Teacher observed:____________________

____

Date________________Time________ Observer-Rater____________________

I. Input Items Related to the Child's Cognitive-Symbolic Behaviors

1. Extent to which the teacher insists that the child use verbal communication. (The teacher does not accept nods, gestures, "sign language" in lieu of verbal communication.)

    1. Always (with very rare exceptions) insists that the child use verbal communication.
    2. Usually insists that the child use verbal communication.
    3. Insists on verbal communication more often than she does not insist.
    4. Insists on verbal communication about as often as she does not insist.
    5. Does not insist on verbal communication more often than she does insist
    6. Usually does not insist that the child use verbal communication.
    7. Never or very rarely insists on verbal communication.

2. Extent to which each child is given the opportunity to organize and to express his ideas in explaining what he is doing.

    1. Each child is given approximately equal opportunity to express himself.
    2. Most of the children are give about an equal opportunity to express themselves.
    3. Somewhat over half of the children are given an equal opportunity.
    4. About half of the children are given an equal opportunity.
    5. Somewhat less than half of the children are given an equal opportunity.
    6. Only a few of the children are given about an equal opportunity to express themselves.
    7. Only one or two (or none) of the children are give an opportunity to express themselves.

3. Extent to which each child is given the opportunity to organize and to express his ideas in answering questions.

    1. Each child is given approximately equal opportunity to express himself.
    2. Most of the children are given about an equal opportunity to express themselves.
    3. Somewhat over half of the children are given an equal opportunity.
    4. About half of the children are give an equal opportunity.
    5. Somewhat less than half of the children are given an equal opportunity.
    6. Only a few of the children are give about an equal opportunity to express themselves.
    7. Only one or two (or none) of the children are given an opportunity to express themselves.

NAME: Parent Participation Record: Center Activities
DEVELOPER: OEO/H.S. Washington Central Office Staff
METHOD: Self-report, questionnaire
SCOPE: Curriculum, demographic
DATA FORMAT: Verbal description, codes, and checks
PERSONNEL: Program

The form Parent Participation Record - Center Activities was completed by the Coordinator of Parent Activities for each Head Start Center. Several items sought information about organizational structure of parent committees, the amount and nature of involvement in program operation. Other series of questions were concerned with the number and kinds of meetings for parents, kind and extent of training and counseling of parents, kind and amount of employment of parents as staff members. One brief section inquired about type of housing of parents.

Budget Bureau No. 116-R0104; Approval Expires August 31, 1969

FORM CAP-HS-45
(1-7-69)

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
PROJECT HEAD START

PARENT PARTICIPATION RECORD CENTER ACTIVITIES

Grant number	Center number
Center name	
Center address *(Number and street, city, State, ZIP code)*	

INSTRUCTIONS – This form is to be completed by the Coordinator of Parent Activities for each center about parent activities. (Do not report parent classroom activities for an individual class as these are to be reported by the teacher in the Parent Classroom Activities record for classes (CAP-HS-45a).

Number of –		Time period covered *(From beginning of current program to date)*				
Children			Month	Day	Year	Number of months covered by this form
Mothers		From				
Fathers		To				

Part I – PARENT ORGANIZATION ACTIVITIES

A. POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Does your Center have a Policy Advisory Committee? .... 1☐ Yes *(Skip to Q.3)* 2☐ No *(Go to Q.2)*

2. If "No," does your Center have parent representation on a Policy Advisory Committee? .... 1☐ Yes *(Go to Q.3)* 2☐ No *(Skip to Sec. B)*

3. Total number of members on the Policy Advisory Committee .... Number

4. Total number of parents from your Center represented on a Policy Advisory Committee .. Number of – Mothers Fathers

5. Are members elected or appointed? .... 1☐ Elected 2☐ Appointed

6. Does the Policy Advisory Committee aid in any of the following: *(Mark all applicable categories)*

a. Selection of –
- (1) Paid professional staff .... ☐
- (2) Non-professional staff .... ☐
- (3) Consultants .... ☐
- (4) Other *(Specify)*__________ ☐

b. Project administration –
- (1) Determination of time and leave regulations .... ☐
- (2) Preparation or approval of budget .... ☐
- (3) Signing payment checks .... ☐
- (4) Raising funds .... ☐
- (5) Conducting grant negotiation .... ☐
- (6) Other *(Specify)*__________ ☐

c. Program planning –
- (1) Plan or approve program proposal .... ☐
- (2) Determine scope of parent programs .... ☐
- (3) Supervise day to day child program operations .... ☐
- (4) Other *(Specify)*__________ ☐

7. Total number of meetings to date of the Policy Advisory Committee .... Number

B. CENTER-WIDE PARENT GROUP COMMITTEE

1. Does your center have a Center-Wide Parent Group Committee? 1☐ Yes *(Go to Q.2)* 2☐ No *(Skip to Sec. C)*

2. If "Yes," indicate total number of parents regularly and actively involved in Parent Group Committee meetings .... Number of – Mothers Fathers

3. Total number of meetings to date of the Center-Wide Parent Group Committee .... Number

C. CLASS PARENT GROUP COMMITTEES

1. Does your center have Class Parent Group Committees? .... 1☐ Yes *(Go to Q.2)* 2☐ No *(Skip to Part II)*

2. If "Yes," indicate total number of Class Parent Group Committees .... Number

Part II -- PARENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Indicate the number of meetings held to date for each of the following categories under the group(s) sponsoring the meetings.	Number of meetings organized by --			
	Policy Advisory Committee	Center Parent Group Committee	Class Parent Group Committee	Center Staff
A. LECTURES, DEMONSTRATIONS, AND WORKSHOPS 1. Child growth and development	1	2	3	4
2. Structured classroom observations	1	2	3	4
3. Children's literature	1	2	3	4
4. Health education	1	2	3	4
5. Family life and planning	1	2	3	4
6. Speech and language development	1	2	3	4
7. Consumer education	1	2	3	4
8. Household management	1	2	3	4
9. Fiscal management	1	2	3	4
10. Home decorating and repairs	1	2	3	4
11. Nutrition and food preparation	1	2	3	4
12. Clothing (buying, sewing, repairing)	1	2	3	4
13. Gardening (vegetables, flowers)	1	2	3	4
14. Carpentry	1	2	3	4
15. Employment information	1	2	3	4
16. Current civic and social issues	1	2	3	4
17. Use of community resources	1	2	3	4
18. Cultural (art, music)	1	2	3	4
19. Other (Specify) ____________	1	2	3	4
B. SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL EVENTS 20	1	2	3	4
C. FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES **(bake sales; clothing sales)** 21	1	2	3	4
D. CENTER-POLICY AND CURRICULUM PLANNING 22	1	2	3	4
E. TOTAL number of mothers and fathers actively and regularly involved in meetings sponsored by the above. 23 Mothers . . .	1	2	3	4
24 Fathers . . .	1	2	3	4

Part III – CENTER STAFF ACTIVITIES FOR PARENTS

A. TRAINING COURSES FOR PARENTS	Number of –		
	Training sessions	Parents enrolled in each category	
		Mothers	Fathers
1. Literacy (basic education)			
2. Vocational training *(Specify)* ______			
3. Pre-service training (voluntary or paid staff)			
4. In-service training			
5. Other *(Specify)* ______			

B. COUNSELING OF PARENTS	Number of –	
	Contacts *(Count each contact in only one category)*	Families contacted *(Count individuals only once in each category)*
1. Educational/Vocational		
2. Counseling (family, individual) and referrals		
3. Social Service (health, legal, etc.) and referrals		
4. Other *(Specify)* ______		

C. NUMBER OF MOTHERS AND FATHERS SERVING AS STAFF MEMBERS IN THE FOLLOWING POSITIONS:	Volunteer				Paid			
	Full-time		Part-time		Full-time		Part-time	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
1. Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Teacher aides	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Health aides (includes medical, nurses' aides)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. Social service aides (includes community aides, social worker's aides)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Nutrition aides	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Cook and food preparation aides	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. Chauffeur/bus driver	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Transportation and trip aides	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Equipment construction, repair, and building maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. Clerical/secretary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Housekeeper/maid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Launderer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13. Babysitter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14. Other *(Specify)* ______	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

D. HOME VISITS

1. Are home visits made by: ***(Mark all applicable categories)***

1 ☐ Coordinator of Parent Activities
2 ☐ Teachers
3 ☐ Teacher aides
4 ☐ Social workers
5 ☐ Social service aides (includes community aides, social worker aides)
6 ☐ Health aides (includes medical aides, nurses' aides)
7 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ______

2. Indicate average number of home visits made to each family per month:

1 ☐ None
2 ☐ Less than 1
3 ☐ 1
4 ☐ 2
5 ☐ 3
6 ☐ 4
7 ☐ 5 or more

D. HOME VISITS – Continued

3. Indicate number of families in dwellings in each category listed below.

Type of dwelling	Number of families in –		
	Public Housing	Private Housing	Other
a. House			
b. Apartment (1) Large multi-story			
(2) Garden type			
(3) Multi-unit (converted house)			
c. Other *(Specify)* ______			

Comments

NAME: Parent Participation Record: Class
DEVELOPER: OEO/H.S. Washington Central Office Staff
METHOD: Self-report, questionnarie
SCOPE: Curriculum
DATA FORMAT: Codes, ratings, verbal description
PERSONNEL: Program

The teacher of each class in Head Start Centers under study was asked to respond to items asking about who initiated consultations with parents about children, how many such consultations took place, amount and kind of parent participation, reasons for lack of participation. They were also asked whether and where they received training and/or materials and type/emphasis of their curriculum.

Budget Bureau No. 116-R0104; Approval Expires August 31, 1969

FORM CAP-HS-45a (1-6-69) OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROJECT HEAD START **PARENT PARTICIPATION RECORD** **CLASS ACTIVITIES**	Grant number	Center number	Class number
	Number of children in class		Number of months covered by this form

INSTRUCTIONS – This form is to be completed by the teacher for each class in the center about parent classroom activities. (Do not report any parent organization or Center-Wide staff activities for parents as these are to be reported in CAP-HS-45 by Parent Coordinator).	Time period covered *(From beginning of current program to date)*					
	From			To		
	Month	Day	Year	Month	Day	Year

Part I – PARENT-TEACHER ACTIVITIES (for your class only)

	Number of –	
A. Consultations about individual children initiated by –	Children	Consultations
(1) Teacher – at parent's home		
(2) Teacher – at Center		
(3) Parent – at parent's home		
(4) Parent – at Center		
B. Total number of individual families involved in one or more parent-teacher consultations about their children ⟶		
	Number of –	
	Group discussions	Parents involved
C. Informal group discussions between teacher and parents on class activities		

	Number of Parents by frequency of occurance					
D. Number of parents who participate in the following class activities –	Frequently		Occasionally		Not at all	
	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers	Mothers	Fathers
(1) Brings child to school						
(2) Picks child up after school.						
(3) Stays to watch or help in class after bringing child or before taking child home						
(4) Joins child for lunch						
(5) Accompanies child on medical/dental trips						
(6) Participates in making material or equipment for use in the classroom						
(7) Borrows books, toys, or equipment for use in home with child						
(8) Helps with other special class projects *(Specify)* ________________						

E. For those parents who do not participate in class activities give principal reasons you feel they are unable to do so. *(Mark all applicable items)*

(1) No babysitter for small children at home . . . . 1 ☐
(2) Work during class hours . . . . 1 ☐
(3) Lack of transportation . . . . 1 ☐
(4) Illness (self or in family) . . . . 1 ☐
(5) Shyness . . . . 1 ☐
(6) Language barrier . . . . 1 ☐
(7) Lack of interest . . . . 1 ☐

(8) Other *(Specify)* ____________________________ 1 ☐

Continue on reverse side

Part II – CURRICULUM

A. **Indicate whether you attended a Head Start training session and/or utilized materials or curriculum developed from any of the following universities or organizations:** *(Mark one box in each column which is applicable)*

	Attended H.S. training session at:	Utilized materials and/or curriculum from:
1. University of Florida	1 ☐	2 ☐
2. Michigan State University	1 ☐	2 ☐
3. University of Nebraska	1 ☐	2 ☐
4. New York University	1 ☐	2 ☐
5. University of North Carolina at Greensboro	1 ☐	2 ☐
6. Pacific Oaks	1 ☐	2 ☐
7. San Jose State College	1 ☐	2 ☐
8. Texas Southern University	1 ☐	2 ☐
9. Tuskegee Institute	1 ☐	2 ☐
10. Western Washington State College	1 ☐	2 ☐
11. University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee	1 ☐	2 ☐
12. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Developement	1 ☐	2 ☐
13. University of Southern Mississippi	1 ☐	2 ☐
14. Learning Institute of North Carolina	1 ☐	2 ☐
15. Opportunity Corp. of Madison-Buncombe Counties	1 ☐	2 ☐
16. Bank Street College	1 ☐	2 ☐
17. George Peabody College	1 ☐	2 ☐
18. Other *(Specify)* ↓ ______________________	1 ☐	2 ☐

B. **Emphasis of curriculum in your class (Rank order each of the following categories on a continuum of 1 to 7 with 1 being the most applicable to 7 being the least applicable):**

	Number
1. Sensory-motor development (improvement in visual and hearing sensitivity, muscle development and coordination)	
2. Language development (improvement in grammar, vocabulary, communication skills and understanding of speech)	
3. Group and social skills development (improvement in cooperation behavior, ease in working with others, learning rules and accepting group goals)	
4. Concept development (improvement in handling and acquiring such concepts as time, color, size, functional relations)	
5. Academic skill development (improvement in work recognition, writing, drawing, etc.)	
6. Self-esteem development (improvement in the sense of self worth, acceptance, capacity to change the environment, self confidence)	
7. Motivational development (improvement in interest in learning and achievement)	

C. **Indicate whether any of the following labels are directly applicable to the type of curriculum in your class** *(Mark one box only):*

1 ☐ Montessori

2 ☐ Group day care

3 ☐ Structured ("packaged") language development programs

4 ☐ Structured ("packaged") quantitative development programs

5 ☐ General child development

6 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ______________________

NAME: Pedersen (no name indicated)

DEVELOPER: Frank Pedersen

METHOD: Observation - Individual Child Based

SCOPE: S Behavior, T Behavior, Curriculum

DATA FORMAT: Codes/tallies

PERSONNEL: Non-program

Not as much is known about this procedure as would be desired. Personal conversations with the developer and one of his associates Dr. David Fox, plus an examination of a preliminary coding manual has provided the basis for this description.

The procedure has been used in developmental form with several classes in the Washington, D.C. area. At least two different observers on the developer's staff had been trained for the task. Presumably reliability information will be forthcoming. To the writers' knowledge no training of observers and data collection has been attempted beyond this initial study.

The same individual child is observed for an entire program day in observation units comprised of 20 recording segments. Observing and recording are nearly simultaneous, with observation occurring for 2 minutes immediately followed by a recording period.

There are fifteen categories of child, teacher, and curriculum and activity characteristics which are recorded during each observation. Child characteristics include attention, social behavior, affect and response to controls. Curriculum and activity charactistics include: activity, character of activity, cognitive tasks, task qualifiers, and social participation. Teacher characteristics include agent focus control activities, control techniques, cognitive tasks, cognitive techniques, and social reinforcement. Each category must be coded with one only of the many alternate codes, during each 2 minute observation.

A preliminary manual has been constructed but includes only definitions of codes with other characteristics of the procedure use left unspecified.

The recording sheet is an 8-1/2 x 14 sheet with columns for each of the 15 code categories and with rows for up to 20 observations for the same subject. Other S and setting information are contained at the top of the recording sheet as well as "an abbreviated designator" for each alternative in each code category.

REFERENCE:

Pedersen, F. and Fox, D. Codebook.

Subject ______________ Observer -104a- Date ______________ Teacher and Sc

1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Activity 1. Maintenance 2. Transition 3. Cog. Task 4. Soc. Inter. 5. Other		Char.Act. 1.Struc. 2.Unstr. 3.Fr Ch. 4.StLCH 5.P Rst. 6.H Rst.	Atten. 1.Unoc 2.Min 3.Mod 4.F.A.	Cog. T. 1.VDis 2.ADis 3.SDis 4.Quant 5.Label 6.Cat. 7.Inf. 8.GVeb 9.VRec 0.FntEx W.SlfEx X.G.Mtr Y.F.Mtr Z.Exp.	Task Q. 1.InAss 2.Exp. 3.Const 4.Fant 5.Soc I 6.Maint	Soc.Bch. 1.Verbal 2.N-Verb 3.Sol.FB 4.SCogC 5.Ch.Con 6.SocOnlo 7.Teacher 8.Other Adult 9.Peer or Peers	Soc.Par 1.Sol. 2.ParPl 3.AssPl 4.CopPl 5.ComAct 6.=1x 7.=2x 8.=3x 9.=4x X.=T.Int	Ch.Aff. 1.PosAf 2.NegAf 3.Ang 4.Sad 5.CLocus 6.HMPO. 7.HMPers 8.HMVV 9.HMTS
	1	2 - 3	4	5 - 11	12 - 14	15 - 21	22	23 - 30
1)								
2)								
3)								
4)								
5)								
6)								
7)								
8)								
9)								
10)								
11)								
12)								
13)								
14)								
15)								
16)								
17)								
18)								
19)								
20)								

hool ______________________ -104b- F W S | Obs. 1 2 3 | Time period 1 2 3

9	10		11		12		13		14		15	
ResCon	Agent Foc.		Cntl.Act		Cntl.Tec.		Cog. Tsk.		Cog.Tec.		Soc. Rf.	
1.Com 2.Non-Com	1.Teacher 2.Aide 3.Vist Th 4.Ref,Ch. 5.Ref.Ch. + 1-3 6.Ref.Ch. + 4-9 7.Ref.Ch. or more		1.Init. 2.Sus. 3.Term. 4.Re-Dit 5.Inhib. 6.Mod/Co 7.Delay 8.Att.Al 9.StrExp.		1.Direct 2.Mod.D 3.Con.Rwd 4.Con.GA 5.Con.Tht 6.Model 7.Ph.Man 8.NV.Sym 9.Ratnl. 0.Exp.Ch.		0.Vis Sen- 1.Vis Dis 2.A Dis 3.S Dis 4.Quant. 5.Label 6.Cat. 7.Inf. 8.G. Vcb. 9. Reci. X.Sp, MS		1.Emits 2.Demo. 3.Elic. 4.PFeed 5.NFeed 6.M.Ad.		1.Rech.Pres. 2.Pos.Rf. 3.Neg. Rf. 4.T-R Beh 5.Prod. 6.V. Beh. 7.Con C 8.P-Ev. 9.P-Diff. 0.1DLABF X.Ack-Acc	
31-32	33 - 36		37 - 42		43 - 48		49 - 56		57 - 62		63 - 68	

NAME: Personal Record of School Experience (PROSE)

DEVELOPER: Donald Medley, Carolyn Schluck, and Nancy Ames
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

METHOD: Observation: Individual Child-based

SCOPE: S Behavior, Teacher Behavior, Curriculum, Physical Plant and Facilities, Peer Composition.

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-program

DESCRIPTION: The Personal Record of School Experience was developed by Medley et al. at Educational Testing Service as a procedure for documenting the kinds of moment by moment encounters available to individual children in Head Start and, later, public school classes.

PROSE consists of two recording phases, referred to as the Statement side and as the Context side of the recording sheet. The Statement phase consists of five 30 second records and the Context phase is a summary record of the 2-1/2 prior minutes. Observation records are made on a child three times in an observation day. These three separate observation periods consisting of 5 30second statements and one context (summary) are referred to as Cycles.

PROSE is machine scorable. The Statement items are on one side of the separable answer sheet and the context items are on the reverse side.

The Statement side consists of 11 item groups. These are (1) Level of Participation, (2) Adult Identification, (3) Adult Behavior, (4) & (5) Peer Interaction, (6) Content of Interaction; (7) Interaction Structure, (8) Level of Involvement, (9) Activity Level, (10) Activity, and 11) Manifest Affect.

The context side consists of eight groups of items. These are (1) Instructional Content, (2) Adult Role, (3) Distance, (4) Group Structure, (5) Classroom climate, (6) Pupil Signs, (7) Adult Signs and (8) Materials & Locations.

Four of the item groups on the Context side allow for refined discriminations to be made within an item response *per se*; the manual, however, specifies that only one check within item group should be made.

The procedure contains, in addition to printed machine scorable answer sheets, and a coding manual, a complete manual of instructions, an observer's guide, and a folder (with individual child inserts) to be used during classroom observation.

REFERENCES:

Medley, D.M., Schluck, C.G., and Ames, N.P. *Recording Individual Pupil Experiences in the Classroom: A Manual for Prose Recorders.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.

Medley, D.M. Measurement Rationale. In *Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experiences, ETS - OEO Longitudinal Study, Theoretical Considerations and Measurement Strategies.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Medley, D.M., OSCAR Goes to Nursery School: A New Technique for Observing Pupil Behavior. Paper presented at AERA, 1969.

PERSONAL RECORD OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

1. ARITH	A	B	C
ARTCRF	A	B	C
EXGM	A	B	C
FRPL	A	B	C
HLTHYG	A	B	C
LANG	A	B	C
MUSRTH	A	B	C
RSTSNK	A	B	C
RTNTRN	A	B	C
SCI	A	B	C
SENS	A	B	C
SOSK	A	B	C
SOSI	A	B	C
3. NEXT	A	B	C
NEAR	A	B	C
MID	A	B	C
FRNG	A	B	C
OUT	A	B	C
5. ATT EXC	A	B	C
ATT INS	A	B	C
NSY EXC	A	B	C
NSY BSY	A	B	C
QU BSY	A	B	C
QU IDL	A	B	C

	A		B		C	
2. SHOW	T	O	T	O	T	O
TELL	T	O	T	O	T	O
LEAD	T	O	T	O	T	O
DSCS	T	O	T	O	T	O
PEER	T	O	T	O	T	O
MNG	T	O	T	O	T	O
SPVS	T	O	T	O	T	O
RSRCE	T	O	T	O	T	O
HSKP	T	O	T	O	T	O
INDATT	T	O	T	O	T	O
LSWT	T	O	T	O	T	O
NCNT	T	O	T	O	T	O

	A		B		C	
4. ONE	AC	NA	AC	NA	AC	NA
TWO	AC	NA	AC	NA	AC	NA
3-5	AC	NA	AC	NA	AC	NA
6+	AC	NA	AC	NA	AC	NA
ALL	AC	NA	AC	NA	AC	NA

▮

0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	A
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	B
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	C
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	D
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	E
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	F
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	G
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	H
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	I
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	J
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	K
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	L
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	M
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N
0	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	O

6. USED NUMBERS	A	B	C
USED WORDS	A	B	C
SNG, TKD TO SLF	A	B	C
HELPED OTHER P	A	B	C
COMFORTED P	A	B	C
SHAFF P	A	B	C
ASKED P FOR HELP	A	B	C
REC'D HLP, AFF	A	B	C
REJECTED BY GRP	A	B	C
ACCIDENT, HURT	A	B	C
SHOWED FEAR	A	B	C
CRIED	A	B	C
LOST TEMPER	A	B	C
TATTLED	A	B	C
LED OTHER P	A	B	C
BOSSED OTHER P	A	B	C
WRECKED SOMETHING	A	B	C
REFUSED HELP	A	B	C
RESISTED AD	A	B	C
DISOBEYED	A	B	C
SHOST TO AD	A	B	C
RID	A	B	C
BAD EX	A	B	C
GOOD EX	A	B	C
CHORE, ERRAND	A	B	C
SHAFF AD	A	B	C
WAITED	A	B	C

	A		B		C	
7. CLD4OT	P	W	P	W	P	W
THRT	P	W	P	W	P	W
LSTMP	P	W	P	W	P	W
LFTW	P	W	P	W	P	W
PHRSTR	P	W	P	W	P	W
8. ART (PAINT, CLAY)	M	L	M	L	M	L
CRAFT	M	L	M	L	M	L
MUSICAL INSTR	M	L	M	L	M	L
BOOKS, WRITING	M	L	M	L	M	L
PUZZLES, QU GAMES	M	L	M	L	M	L
BLOCKS	M	L	M	L	M	L
WHEEL TOYS	M	L	M	L	M	L
TOOLS, WK BENCH	M	L	M	L	M	L
SAND	M	L	M	L	M	L
GYM, EXERCISE	M	L	M	L	M	L
PET	M	L	M	L	M	L
CLOTHES, JEWELRY	M	L	M	L	M	L
FOOD, WATER	M	L	M	L	M	L
DOLLS	M	L	M	L	M	L
HOMEMAKING	M	L	M	L	M	L
CLEANUP TOOLS	M	L	M	L	M	L
AUDIO-VISUAL DEV	M	L	M	L	M	L
SP INSTRC DEV	M	L	M	L	M	L
SCIENCE EQUIP	M	L	M	L	M	L
ASSIGNED SEAT		L		L		L
TEACHER'S DESK		L		L		L
OPEN AREA		L		L		L
TOILET		L		L		L
PLAYGROUND		L		L		L
OUT OF ROOM		L		L		L

168

Be sure each mark is *dark* and *completely fills* the answer space.
Do not make any stray marks on either side of this sheet.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		CYCLE A	CYCLE B	CYCLE C	
1.	INIT	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	INIT
	STAR	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	STAR
	PART	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	PART
	LSWT	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	LSWT
2.	TCHR	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	TCHR
	AA	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	AA
	TAA	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	TAA
	OBS	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	OBS
	OTH	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	OTH
3.	POS	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	POS
	PRM	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	PRM
	SHTL	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	SHTL
	LSQU	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	LSQU
	DO4	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	DO4
	CNTR	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	CNTR
	NEG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	NEG
4.	AGR	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	AGR
	INIT	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	INIT
	COOP	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	COOP
	WTHD	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	WTHD
	RST	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	RST
5.	AGR	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	AGR
	INIT	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	INIT
	COOP	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	COOP
	WTHD	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	WTHD
	RST	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	RST

		CYCLE A	CYCLE B	CYCLE C	
6.	CNTC	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	CNTC
	MTL	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	MTL
	VRB	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	VRB
7.	OSOG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	OSOG
	OSSG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	OSSG
	SSOG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	SSOG
	SSSG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	SSSG
8.	COOP	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	COOP
	DSTR	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	DSTR
	RIS	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	RIS
	WOA	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	WOA
	DSRP	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	DSRP
9.	HIWL	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	HIWL
	MDWL	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	MDWL
	HINL	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	HINL
	MDNL	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	MDNL
	LOW	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	LOW
10.	FANT	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	FANT
	DVG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	DVG
	CVG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	CVG
	WRK	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	WRK
	KIN	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	KIN
11.	POS	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	POS
	NEG	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	NEG

REMARKS

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J. 08540

8108P50D

NAME: Post Observation Teacher Rating Scale (P.O.T.)

DEVELOPER: John Dopyera, Linda Hollingshead, David Lindstrom
Head Start Evaluation and Research Center
Syracuse University

METHOD: Observation: teacher-based

SCOPE: Teacher behavior

DATA FORMAT: Rating Scale

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Post Observation Teacher Rating Scale (P.O.T.) was developed as an adjunct data-collecting device to be used by OSCI observers subsequent to making the regular Head Start observations. The rationale for its development concerned (1) further utilization of items from the ORF which were found to differentiate between settings in regard to children's Stanford-Binet gains and (2) additional use of the information gained by observers while making observations for the OSCI. This simply required a different ordering by the observer of the data collected in the Head Start classes, e.g., a comprehensive impressionistic perspective rather than a detailed category schema.

The P.O.T. consists of 33 items drawn from a variety of sources and revised into a common 5 point response format with a sixth category reserved for "no basis for judgment."

The P.O.T. manual consists of three sections: (1) general procedures; (2) item descriptions accompanied by an explanation of each item; (3) a codebook for keypunching and processing the data. The manual suggests, as an alternative to keypunching, the use of IBM visual scanning sheets for recording the ratings.

The P.O.T. was one of the procedures (OSCI/Administrative checklist/Post Program Interview with Teachers/CFRI) used during the 1968-69 National Head Start Evaluation effort. A P.O.T. record was obtained five times on each Head Start class in the national sample (over 150); an initial P.O.T. record was made early in the evaluation and then 4 additional records were completed immediately after each OSCI record.

REFERENCES:

Dopyera, J.D., Hollingshead, L. and Lindstrom, D. Post Observation Teacher Rating Scales (P.O.T.). Mimeographed paper, Syracuse University, 1968.
Also: Code Book for Post Observation Teacher Rating Scales (P.O.T.).

23. To what extent does the teacher initiate discussion about past experiences, ask children for comparisons, suppositions, or cause children to question occurrences? (S.U)

1. Constantly
2. Frequently
3. Occasionally
4. Infrequently
5. Opportunity present; behavior did not occur
0. No basis for judgment -- occasion did not occur

Explanation: Teacher may ask "Why is the flower or plant wilting?" "What happens if...?" Does she do experiments?

24. To what extent does the teacher use a large and varied repertoire of modes of communication? (S.U.)

1. Constantly
2. Frequently
3. Occasionally
4. Infrequently
5. Opportunity present; behavior did not occur
0. No basis for judgment

Explanation: Variation in tone of voice, affect, motion, gestures.

25. Type of punishment used most frequently by teacher:

1. Talking to the child (reasoning), or diverting child to a new activity
2. Group pressure, or loss of privilege
3. Scolding, warning. threatening
4. Isolation within or outside of classroom
5. Physical punishment
0. No occasion for punishment occurred or no basis for judgement

Explanation: Self-explanatory

NAME: Post Program Interview with Teacher (PPIWT)

DEVELOPER: Lois Ellen Data *et. al.*
OEO Head Start
Washington, D.C.

METHOD: Interview: Classroom teacher

SCOPE: Curriculum, physical plant/facilities, administration

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Program, non-program (Interviewer)

The Post Program Interview with Teacher was developed during the summer and fall of 1968 to be used with the National Head Start Evaluation. It was intended that the interview would be conducted with the classroom teacher after the rest of the evaluation of the Head Start program had been completed in the spring or summer of 1969. The purpose of the PPWIT was to determine the extent to which the same components of programs occurred spontaneously across Head Start Centers.

The PPWIT is a 129 item (some items have multiple parts) questionnaire - interview which was administered to the teacher by an Evaluation and Research Center staff member. The PPWIT had as its dominant concern the *post hoc* determination of the kind and amount of special components which were included in the programs just completed. The ten sections concerning special components include structured language, programs' structured and unstructured quantitative emphasis, structured and unstructured combined programs, training in use of packaged materials, planned and instructional use of rewards concurrent with use of instructional materials, Parent Education programs, feedback about National Evaluation, feedback about individual children, feedback concerning class effectiveness, and teacher opinions about teaching practices and child behavior.

The interview takes about two hours and was administered to the teacher either during release time or at the conclusion of the program day.

REFERENCES:

Office of Economic Opportunity, Project Head Start. Post Program Interview with Teacher. Questionnaire form, OEO.

Also: Instructions for administering the Post Program Interview with Teacher.

NAME: Praise-Blame Observation

DEVELOPER: William J. Meyer and David Lindstrom
Headstart Evaluation and Research Center
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

METHOD: Composite: teacher and children -based

SCOPE: Teacher (verbal) behavior; child verbal behavior; curriculum

DATA FORMAT: Codes - tallies

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Praise-Blame Observation system was developed at Syracuse University during the 1968-69 Head Start Evaluation for use in a study of teacher-student cross-racial interactions. The procedure had been used previously by Meyer (1956) in a different form and was adopted by Lindstrom and staff in the present study.

A teacher is observed for an hour a day until a total of fifteen class contact hours have been accumulated. A rotation scheme is provided so that each portion of the classroom schedule is covered equally. During the observation a record is made of each verbal positive or negative reinforcement a teacher directs to a child. The recording indicates the specific child or subgroup of children to whom the reinforcement is directed as well as the activity the child is engaged in when reinforced and/or the context of his activity.

In addition to the praise-blame code categories for identifying the activity and reason for reinforcement are provided. The observer also notes in words the context in which the reinforcement occurs.

Instructions, training materials, recording sheets, formats and a codebook for keypunching the materials have been prepared.

Data was collected in the Syracuse and South Carolina Evaluation and Research Centers in a total of 15 classes. Aides were also observed in these centers for lesser periods of time.

REFERENCE:

Meyer, W.J. and Thompson, G.G. Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth-grade children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 385-396.

Class_______________________

Date________________________

☐ Teacher______________#______

☐ Aide______________#______

Observer__________#_____

Time observed__________

Observation #________ __

Observation Unit (5 min)

[✓ 1] 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Name and Number	S	R	Nature 1	Nature 2	Nature 3	Nature 4	Nature 5	Nature 6
John Smith 0501	m	c	01 knows colors					
ary Brown 0502	f	n	13 keep quiet	13 keep quiet	11 didn't know colors			
James Carter 0503	m	n	14 stop crying					
Group (Indicate those in group above)								

NAME: Preschool Environment Inventory

DEVELOPER: Virginia Stern and Anne Gordon
Research Division
Bank Street College of Education
216 West 14th Street
New York 10011

METHOD: Observation - Composite: Teacher and children based

SCOPE: Teacher behavior; physical plant/facilities; curriculum

DATA FORMAT: Codes; rating scales

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Preschool Environment Inventory was developed specifically for use in evaluation of Head Start programs by the Bank Street College of Education personnel and "embodies the Bank Street view of what is salient in the education of young children." Many of the items, for example, assess the teacher's stance toward children's play. The forms considered in this review are a fall 1967 version and revisions being undertaken in 1968.

The observer, a person familiar with basic concepts in early education, makes a general observation of the teacher and classroom and then responds to a series of checklists and ratings. Several checklists appearing in the form provide rather extensive listing of times under physical setup, materials and equipment, and play activities.

The remainder of the form includes 45 ratings on such items as - Extent to which teacher actively encourages a curious and exploratory attitude in the classrooms and Extent to which teacher displays interest and/or understanding of children's difficulties. In the 1967 version ratings were made on a 5-point continuum for which some anchoring illustrations or frequencies were given for various continuum points. The 1968 revision omitted the anchoring descriptions but instead listed a variety of statements for each scale to be rated which might represent the teacher's behavioral repertoires in these areas. The observer would check off those behaviors observed during observation(s) and then take them into consideration in assigning a final rating on the overall item. The final rating is then considered the datum for analysis, rather than the specific behaviors checked.

The authors described the rating scales as falling into the following categories: program structure, balance, and organization; mode of teaching; teacher's role re language, communication, articulation of ideas and feelings; control and management; aspects of teacher's relationship with children; teacher's role re peer relations, style and time of teacher; classroom atmosphere.

REFERENCES:

Stern, V. and Gordon, A. Development of Observation Procedures for Assessing Preschool Classroom Environment; Document 4. Bank Street Head Start Evaluation and Research Center, December 1967.

Also: Revision of Observation Procedures for Assessing Preschool Classroom Environment.

29. In my school it is understood that it is sometimes necessary to use physical punishment with some children.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Un-Descriptive	Fairly Un-Descriptive	Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive	Fairly Descriptive	Very Descriptive

30. In my school there isn't enough practical help for the teacher who must deal with problem children.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Un-Descriptive	Fairly Un-Descriptive	Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive	Fairly Descriptive	Very Descriptive

31. In my school the children seem to have less curiosity as they progress from kindergarten to the highest grade.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Un-Descriptive	Fairly Un-Descriptive	Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive	Fairly Descriptive	Very Descriptive

32. In my school most teachers provide for a period of planning with children for the goals of various lesson units, e.g., social studies.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Un-Descriptive	Fairly Un-Descriptive	Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive	Fairly Descriptive	Very Descriptive

33. In our school it is thought that more progress can be made by children if classes are organized so that children of like achievement are together.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Un-Descriptive	Fairly Un-Descriptive	Neither Descriptive nor Undescriptive	Fairly Descriptive	Very Descriptive

NAME: School Environment Measure

DEVELOPER: Westinghouse Learning Corporation

METHOD: Self-report: Questionnaire

SCOPE: Curriculum, Teaching Staff, Administrative Staff

DATA FORMAT: Ratings

PERSONNEL: Program (School teachers)

The School Environment Measure (SEM) was developed by Westinghouse Corporation for use in analyzing factors in school environments. It was administered to kindergarten and/or first grade teachers in schools where Head Start children were enrolled following the child's Head Start experience. The measure sought information about factors that the test developers thought "influential in preserving or furthering gains made by children as a result of Head Start experiences.

The measure includes 48 items (example -Parents are encouraged to visit our classrooms.) for which the teacher chooses the response she feels most appropriate from a 5-point scale ranging from Very Un-descriptive to Very Descriptive (of my school).

The items selected were related to eight factors found most promising from the research of Haan and Haan on school environments. These factors were: Open Structural Arrangements, Principle Involvements Open Unstructured Interchange, Suppressive Child Regulation, Alliance, Divisive Angry Interchange, Child Centered Anxiety, and Unequivocal Support.

Reference;

Cooper, W., Circirelli, V.G. and Granger, R.L. The School Environment Measure. Athens, Ohio: Westinghouse Learning Corporation/ Ohio University.

CHECK LIST II - ROOM APPEARANCE AND ARRANGEMENT

	Yes	No
1. Is the room cheerful? (e.g., light-colored walls, children's products displayed)	___	___
2. Is the room clearly subdivided for different activities? (e.g., for painting, block building, doll play, water play)	___	___
3. If so, does the arrangement allow for cross-area movement and play?	___	___
4. Does the arrangement impress you as:		
spacious	___	___
cluttered		

CHECK LIST III - INDOOR MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

	Within reach or sight of children	Out of Reach or sight of children	Not available at Center
1. Building Materials and Accessories			
Unit building blocks	___	___	___
several sizes	___	___	___
different shapes	___	___	___
Small colored cubes	___	___	___
Hollow wood or cardboard blocks .	___	___	___
Boards	___	___	___
Steering wheel(s)	___	___	___
Vehicles:			
small (e.g., cars, trucks, planes, etc.)	___	___	___
large (i.e., child can sit in or on)	___	___	___
Small animal figures	___	___	___
Small human figures	___	___	___
Puppets	___	___	___
Other	___	___	___
2. House Play Equipment			
Small table and chairs	___	___	___
Doll bed	___	___	___
with mattress and/or blankets .	___	___	___
Carriage	___	___	___
Stove	___	___	___

NAME: Sher (no name indicated)

DEVELOPER: Abby Sher and Associates

METHOD: Mixed: observation, interview

SCOPE: S Behavior, teacher behavior; curriculum; physical plant and facilities; peer composition, administrative

DATA FORMAT: Verbal description

PERSONNEL: Non-program

Sher and associates used observations and interviews in combination to compile comprehensive descriptions of programs. The results are detailed case studies which are not then coded into any quantifiable form for further analysis.

A team of three observers, all familiar with classroom procedures, spend a minimum of four days in a given classroom making observations, interviewing personnel, and generally trying to become familiar with all program aspects. During the first day of observation, all three observe "randomly" to gain general familiarity. For each of the remaining days, the observers rotate focus on (a) teacher(s); (b) group; (c) individual child or sub-groups. Tapes or notes are made as determined necessary and time notations are recorded in conjunction with the notes at 10-15 min. intervals. The three points of observation can thus be coordinated for cross reference when written in summary form subsequent to the observation.

The observations and behavioral accounts are supplemented by a teacher interview focusing on teacher background; teacher philosophy; view of curriculum; impressions of children, or change over the year, of aides, of parents. Basic program information is also obtained in an interview with the Director concerning demographic and administrative information.

The data collected is later prepared in summary descriptions according to a prescribed outline.

A sample report done for a classroom at Queen's College Children's Center in April, 1968 included approximately 30 pages of summary in which precisely detailed anecdotes illustrated the generalizations made.

REFERENCE:

Sher, A. et al. Procedures for classroom observation. Informal paper and notes.

NAME: Social Interaction Observation Schedule (SIOS)

DEVELOPER: Barbara Etzel, Russell Tyler (& Staff)
University of Kansas
Head Start Evaluation and Research Center
Lawrence, Kansas

METHOD: Observation: Individual child-based

SCOPE: Subject behavior, teacher behavior, peer composition

DATA FORMAT: Codes & tallies

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Social Interaction Observation Schedule is a procedure for documenting the interpersonal interactions of a specific child during free-play periods. Verbal and non-verbal behaviors initiated either by the target subject to peer(s) or to an adult or by others to the subject are recorded in 18 ten-second periods for a total of three minutes per observation. The SIOS was developed with Head Start funding under the direction of Drs. Barbara Etzel and Russell Tyler of the Head Start Research and Evaluation Center, University of Kansas, during the spring of 1967, and was subsequently used in the 1967-68 National Evaluation.

This procedure is typically utilized as a criterion measure for children's social behavior and is included in this report because it illustrates how documentation of the behaviors and interaction contexts of behavior may be used as data for a "composition"' component of a program environment.

The SIOS procedure requires the observer to locate the target child and, after a temporal randomization period, observe the target child for a period of three minutes - making a notation in each of the 18 ten second periods. Any non-verbal interaction that occurs and the response, if any, which occurs is recorded - concurrent with the observation. After the three minutes, the observer terminated the record, locates the next child, and begins another record, rotating among the children to be observed until a total of three observations (9 minutes) have been completed for each student.

In the initial use of the SIOS, a cumulative total of 45 minutes per child over a minumum of a five day period was required. It was subsequently determined that base-rates from a 30 minute sample (10 three minute periods) were not significantly different from the 45 minute base rates.

Tally sheets were provided for preliminary analysis of SIOS data at the child and the class level. The tally sheets were designed to group data by the source (subject, other) and kind of interaction.

While these data were used within the context of a pre-post design as a criterion measure for social-emotional development, the data are equally pertinent to the determination of program environment variables such as interaction density, since initiations from others may be summated by type, source, and settings.

The absence of content associated with the interaction records creates a serious concern for users of this type of procedure, particularly persons reflecting an orientation not sympathetic to the behavioral modification (contingency management) point of view.

REFERENCES:

University of Kansas Head Start Evaluation and Research Center. Social Interaction Observation Procedure: Training Manual Additions.

Also: Small Group Practice Session Exercises I, II, III.
Establishment of Interobserver Reliability - SIOS.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS HEAD START RESEARCH AND EVALUATION CENTER
Department of Human Development

SOCIAL INTERACTION OBSERVATION FORM

E and R.	Center	Class	Obser.	Date			Session	Week of Center Operation
							AM PM	

▨	Minute 1	Minute 2	Minute 3

Child No.	Letter	Time	Activity

V																		
N																		

Child No.	Letter	Time	Activity

V																		
N																		

Child No.	Letter	Time	Activity

V																		
N																		

Child No.	Letter	Time	Activity

V																		
N																		

A_1 ______________________
A_2 ______________________
A_3 ______________________
A_4 ______________________
A_5 ______________________
A_6 ______________________
A_7 ______________________
A_8 ______________________
A_9 ______________________
A_{10} ______________________
A_{11} ______________________
A_{12} ______________________
A_X ______________________
A_X ______________________
A_X ______________________

Developed under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity Head Start Research and Evaluation

NAME: Spaulding Teacher Activity Rating Schedule - STARS

DEVELOPER: Robert L. Spaulding
Educational Improvement Center
Durham, North Carolina

METHOD: Observation: teacher based

SCOPE: Teacher behavior

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-program

The Spaulding Teacher Activity Rating Schedule - STARS - was developed as a means of obtaining baseline and post-treatment data for examining teacher-child interactions. At the EIP center in Durham, N.C., it is used in conjunction with an instrument recording pupil responses (Coping Analysis Schedule for Educational Settings - CASES) in assessing the effectiveness of planned behavioral modification techniques.

The instrument uses five main categories for examining teacher behavior: (a) cognitive structuring; (b) behavior management; (c) motor structuring; (d) converse-teacher-child transaction not focusing on modification of child behavior; (e) non-child-teacher behaviors which are not child transactional. The first three of the above major categories are further sub-divided into codes of (a) Appr.-teacher operants with generally reinforcing affect, (b) Disapp - teacher operants with generally punishing affect, (c) Do - teacher operants setting or eliciting performance goals and action, (d) Don't - teacher operants proscribing certain actions, (e) Neu -teacher operants conveying other information, (f) List- teacher attending to child or group operants. The main category, Converse, is further coded as Talk or List, depending on the direction of transaction. The main category of Non child is coded as either Adult for transactions not with children or pers for personal activities.

The percentage of time spent in behavior in each sub-category is later determined and may be graphed and compared with child behaviors emitted during the same period. Spaulding (1967) reports the use of STARS in assessing effectiveness of teacher behavior for an individual child or group, in providing feedback for teacher training, for comparing classrooms.

STARS resulted from a previous study of Spaulding in which an analytic study of approximately 113 categories of teacher-child transactions revealed three types of teacher variables significantly related to subsequent pupil performance and self-concept: (1) supportive, approving and receptive teacher behaviors which operated as rewards; (2) aversive or dominative teacher behaviors which had, generally, a punishing effect; (3) limit and goal setting teacher behaviors which tended to clarify, regularize, organize, or further structure the environment for the benefit of pupil performance.

REFERENCES:

The Durham Educational Improvement Program 1966 - 1967: EIP Research. Durham, North Carolina: EIP, 1967.

Spaulding, R.L. The Durham Education Improvement Program. In Brison, D.W. and Hill, Jane, Eds. *Psychology and Early Childhood Education.* Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Institute of Developmental Studies, 1966.

NAME:	Staff-Member Information
DEVELOPER:	OEO/H.S. Washington, Central Office Staff
METHOD:	Self-report Questionnaire
SCOPE:	Staff demographic characteristics
DATA FORMAT:	Checks and codes
PERSONNEL:	Program

The first portion of the Staff Member Information form was completed by the Center Director of Head Start Centers identifying the job title and function of the staff member. The staff member was then asked for information about age, ethnic/racial group, sex, general education, general professional education, specific training and prior experience in Head Start, residence, family income, language and Head Start enrollments of own children.

Budget Bureau No. 116-R0106; Approval Expires August 31, 1969

FORM CAP-HS-43
(12-26-68)

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
PROJECT HEAD START

STAFF MEMBER INFORMATION

Part A	The information in this area is to be completed by the Center Director prior to giving this form to Staff Member for completion.

Grant number	Center number	Staff member number	Class number *(If applicable)*	Number of hours worked per week . . . . ☐ 1 ☐ Full-time employment 2 ☐ Part-time employment

Job title of Staff Member at this center *(Mark one box only)*

PROFESSIONAL

Educational/Psychological/Social

1 ☐ Administrative, managerial
2 ☐ Teacher
3 ☐ Psychologist, psychiatrist
4 ☐ Counselor
5 ☐ Speech therapist
6 ☐ Social Worker
7 ☐ Consultant (education, art, music, psychological, etc.)
8 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ____________________

Medical/Dental

9 ☐ Physician
10 ☐ Dentist
11 ☐ Optometrist
12 ☐ Nurse
13 ☐ Dental hygienist
14 ☐ Physical therapist
15 ☐ Nutritionist
16 ☐ Technician (lab., X-ray, etc.)
17 ☐ Consultant (Medical/Dental etc.)
18 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ____________________

SEMI-PROFESSIONAL

Educational/Psychological/Social

19 ☐ Teachers aide
20 ☐ Social Services aid (includes social workers aides; community aides, etc.)
21 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ____________________

Medical/Dental

22 ☐ Health aide (includes medical aides, nurses aides, etc.)
23 ☐ Dental assistant
24 ☐ Nutritionists' aide

NONPROFESSIONAL

25 ☐ Cook, chauffeur, maintenance worker
26 ☐ Secretary, clerk
27 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ____________________

Function(s) of Staff Member at this center – Does this staff member serve as: *(Mark all applicable boxes)*

Director of:

1 ☐ Center Child Development Program
2 ☐ Education Program
3 ☐ Medical Services
4 ☐ Dental Services
5 ☐ Social Services
6 ☐ Nurse Administrator
7 ☐ Psychological Services
8 ☐ Nutrition Program
9 ☐ Career Development and Training
10 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ____________________

Coordinator of:

11 ☐ Volunteers
12 ☐ Parent Activities
13 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ____________________

14 ☐ None of these

Continue on page 2

Part B The remainder of this form is to be completed by the Staff Member, and returned to the Center Director. *Check one response box for each question unless otherwise indicated.*

1. AGE

1 ☐ Under 16
2 ☐ 16–21
3 ☐ 22–27
4 ☐ 28–33
5 ☐ 34–39
6 ☐ 40–45
7 ☐ 46–51
8 ☐ 52–57
9 ☐ 58 and over

2. ETHNIC/RACIAL GROUP

a. Caucasian
  1 ☐ Mexican-American
  2 ☐ Puerto Rican
  3 ☐ Other Caucasian
b. 4 ☐ Negro
c. 5 ☐ American Indian
d. 6 ☐ Oriental
e. 7 ☐ Eskimo
f. 8 ☐ Polynesian
g. 9 ☐ Other

3. SEX

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

4. EDUCATION

a. Years completed

1 ☐ None
2 ☐ 1–4 years } Elementary school
3 ☐ 5–8 years }
4 ☐ 9–10 years } High school
5 ☐ 11–12 years }
6 ☐ 1–2 years } College
7 ☐ 3–4 years }
8 ☐ 5-or-more years }

b. Highest level completed

1 ☐ None
2 ☐ Elementary
3 ☐ High school
4 ☐ Associate of Arts degree
5 ☐ Bachelor's degree, Major ________
6 ☐ Master's degree, Major ________
7 ☐ Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS)
8 ☐ Doctor of Medicine (MD), Specialty ________
9 ☐ Other doctorate degree, Major ________
10 ☐ Registered Nurse, Specialty ________
11 ☐ Licensed Practical Nurse
12 ☐ Other *(Specify)* ________

QUESTION 5 IS TO BE FILLED OUT BY ALL PROFESSIONAL AND SEMI-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL/SOCIAL PERSONNEL (SEE CATEGORIES LISTED IN PART A.)

5. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

a. Have you taken education courses leading to a degree (whether you received the degree or not) in Education or Home Economics at a college or university?

1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

b. If "Yes" – Was your major field –

1 ☐ Early Childhood Development (with supervised nursery school practice teaching)?
2 ☐ Elementary Education (with supervised nursery school practice teaching)?
3 ☐ Home Economics (with supervised nursery school practice teaching)?
4 ☐ Other education (with supervised nursery school practice teaching)?
5 ☐ Early Childhood Development (with no nursery school practice teaching)?
6 ☐ Elementary Education (no nursery school practice teaching)?
7 ☐ Home Economics (no nursery school practice teaching)?
8 ☐ Secondary Education (no nursery school practice teaching)?
9 ☐ Other education (no nursery school practice teaching)?

5. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (Continued)

c. If "No" – Have you –

(1) Taken a nursery school practice teaching course as an elective in your college or university?

1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

(2) Taken course work in or including child development or early childhood education in your college or university?

1 ☐ No course work
2 ☐ An introductory course
3 ☐ Introductory and advanced course work

d. Before you were employed by Head Start, did you take –

(1) An adult education course in early childhood development (not leading to a degree or certificate)?

1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

If "Yes" – How long did the course last? *(Give number of months)*.......... ________

(2) A course in nursery school teaching outside of a college or university (e.g. Montessori or other teaching methods)?

1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

(a) If "Yes" – How long did the course last? *(Give number of months)*........ ________

(b) If "Yes" – Did you receive a certificate at the end of the course?

1 ☐ Yes   2 ☐ No

Continue on page 3

QUESTION 6 IS TO BE FILLED OUT BY ALL PROFESSIONAL AND SEMI-PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL/DENTAL PERSONNEL ONLY. (SEE CATEGORIES LISTED IN PART A.)

6. Have you –

a. Had special training or experience in health care of preschool children?
1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

b. Had previous experience with educational programs for preschool children?
1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

QUESTIONS 7 THROUGH 17 ARE TO BE FILLED OUT BY EVERYONE

7. Have you attended any training activities connected with your Head Start employment?
(Check all boxes that are applicable)

1 ☐ 8-week university sponsored Head Start training program

Indicate how many you have attended:
1 ☐ One
2 ☐ Two
3 ☐ Three or more

2 ☐ 5-day university sponsored Head Start orientation program

Indicate how many you have attended:
1 ☐ One
2 ☐ Two
3 ☐ Three
4 ☐ Four or more

3 ☐ In-service lectures, movies, demonstrations on Child Development offered through your Head Start supervisor or agency

Give the number attended in the last month ________

4 ☐ In-service training and guidance from your supervisor or trained personnel on teaching your preschool children

Give the number attended in the last month
Training in class room techniques (art, science, etc.) .... ________
Guidance with psychological problems .... ________

5 ☐ Adult education or extension courses offered by a local college or university for credit after being employed by Head Start

6 ☐ Not applicable

8. How much experience did you have with preschoolers before working for Head Start? *(Mark the appropriate box in each column)*

	Paid	Volunteer
None or less than 6 months	1 ☐	1 ☐
6 months – 2 years	2 ☐	2 ☐
3 – 5 years	3 ☐	3 ☐
Over 5 years	4 ☐	4 ☐

9. How much experience did you have with groups of children from conditions of poverty before working for Head Start? *(Mark the appropriate box in each column)*

	Paid	Volunteer
None or less than 6 months	1 ☐	1 ☐
6 months – 2 years	2 ☐	2 ☐
3 – 5 years	3 ☐	3 ☐
Over 5 years	4 ☐	4 ☐

10. How much experience did you have with individuals (of any age) or families from conditions of poverty before working for Head Start? *(Mark the appropriate box in each column)*

	Paid	Volunteer
None or less than 6 months	1 ☐	1 ☐
6 months – 2 years	2 ☐	2 ☐
3 – 5 years	3 ☐	3 ☐
Over 5 years	4 ☐	4 ☐

11. Head Start Employment

a. How many months of Head Start employment have you had? .... ________

b. Have you been employed in previous Head Start programs (prior to the current one)?
1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

c. If "Yes" indicate in which Head Start program(s) you were previously employed.
1 ☐ Summer 1965
2 ☐ Full year 1965–66
3 ☐ Summer 1966
4 ☐ Full year 1966–67
5 ☐ Summer 1967
6 ☐ Full year 1967–68
7 ☐ Summer 1968

d. If "Yes," indicate job title of position(s) you held in the previous program(s) *(See: Job Title categories listed on page 1, under part A.)*

____

12a. Number of centers you serve
1 ☐ One
2 ☐ More than one – List on reverse side all centers served.

b. Are you associated with only one class at only one center?
3 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

13. Residence
Do you live in the neighborhood near this center or any center you serve?
1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

14. Are you a paid or volunteer worker at this center?
1 ☐ Paid 2 ☐ Volunteer

Continue on page 4

Part B – Continued

15. What is your total annual family income?

- 1 ☐ Under $1,500
- 2 ☐ $1,500 – 1,999
- 3 ☐ 2,000 – 2,499
- 4 ☐ 2,500 – 2,999
- 5 ☐ 3,000 – 3,499
- 6 ☐ 3,500 – 3,999
- 7 ☐ $4,000 – 4,499
- 8 ☐ 4,500 – 4,999
- 9 ☐ 5,000 – 5,499
- 10 ☐ 5,500 – 5,999
- 11 ☐ 6,000 – 7,999
- 12 ☐ 8,000 – 9,999
- 13 ☐ $10,000 or more

16. What languages (other than English) do you speak fluently?

- 1 ☐ None
- 2 ☐ French
- 3 ☐ Spanish
- 4 ☐ Other *(Specify)*____________

17. What languages (other than English) do you use with the children in the program?

- 1 ☐ None
- 2 ☐ French
- 3 ☐ Spanish
- 4 ☐ Other *(Specify)*____________

18. Do you have a child (or children) enrolled:

- 1 ☐ Now in a Head Start program at this center or any Head Start center you serve
- 2 ☐ Now in a Head Start program but not at this center nor any Head Start center you serve
- 3 ☐ Not in any current Head Start program, but enrolled in a previous Head Start program
- 4 ☐ Not in a current or previous Head Start program
- 5 ☐ Not applicable

Comments

NAME: Teacher Behavior Survey Instrument

DEVELOPER: Lilian G. Katz
Department of Education
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, California

METHOD: Observation: teacher-based

SCOPE: Teacher behavior, curriculum

DATA FORMAT: Codes

PERSONNEL: Non-personnal

The Teacher Behavior Survey Instrument was designed to record teacher behavior in five major areas - (1) contact -with whom, initiation, and type, (2) teaching - feedback, (3) control, (4) nurturance, (5) dominant tone. Also recorded is the activity of the children or teacher at the time of the observation.

The observer makes observations at specified times (e.g., at 9:00, 9:05, 9:10, etc.) looking at the teacher just long enough to be sure what the behavior is -- rarely more than 10 seconds. The recording is then undertaken for all of the six areas listed above in regard to the brief observation.

Katz (1968) used the TBSI in a comparison study of a teacher-structured approach vs. a personal-social approach to verify application of treatments. The data reportedly indicated that one of the treatment conditions (application of rewarding behaviors) had not been met for the teacher-structured approach.

In the above study, inter-observer reliabilities were obtained at the end of a training period and again after all the teacher observations had been completed. In the following listing of sub-areas, the first number indicates the per cent agreement at completion of training and the second prior to completing all observations: contact dimension -100, 70: teaching dimension -89, 93; feedback -95, 75: control -96, 75; nurturance -89, 50; tone -89, (none reported).

REFERENCES:

Katz, Lilian G., Peters, D.L., and Skin, N.S. Observing behavior in Kindergarten and preschool classes. Unpublished report.

Katz, Lilian G. A study of the changes in behavior of children enrolled in two types of Head Start classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1968.

NAME:	Teacher Observation Schedule
DEVELOPER:	Harold Wilensky c/o Institute of Developmental Studies School of Education New York University
METHOD:	Observation - teacher based
SCOPE:	Teacher (verbal) behavior
DATA FORMAT:	Codes
PERSONNEL:	Non-program

The Teacher Observation Scale (TOS) measures four dimensions of teacher "style" - information-giving, eliciting responses, feedback, control. The procedure is intended for use while teacher conducts a group lesson or reads a story.

Continuous recording and categorization of teacher-pupil behavior into general categories are made by a single observer for five minute periods. The focus is primarily on the teacher throughout this period with peripheral attention to the children to gain contextual cues necessary for differentiating between kinds of teacher behavior. Categories utilized are (a) information-giving, (b) eliciting responses, (c) feedback, (d) confirmations, (e) supportive confirmation, (f) negation, (g) corrective negation, (h) control.

The observer must determine and record each "unit" of behavior at the rate of/at which it occurs. A unit may consist of a sentence, a phrase, a word, a gesture which is considered to have a complete meaning. Several consecutive units may fall into the same category. The reported inter-rater reliability exceeded .90 for the four main dimensions of teacher style (feedback categories and control units were combined in this analysis.)

The procedure was utilized by Wilensky in a study of four IDS preschool classes. Between 2 3/4 and 3 1/3 of observation hours per class were obtained across 15% of the school days. Striking differences were found between teachers on sheer amount of behavior units recorded as well as differences between categories.

REFERENCES:

Institute for Developmental Studies. Interim Progress Report. Part II. Research and Evaluation. Unpublished document, IDS, New York University, 1968.

Wilensky, H. Observational Techniques in Preschool Classrooms. Unpublished document, Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966.

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

TEACHER OBSERVATION SCALE (TOS)

Teacher__________ Ass't Teacher__________ Observer__________

School__________ No. of Children__________

Date__________ Time Started__________ Finished__________

Topic____

CATEGORIES

	No. of Units	Information Given	Eliciting Responses	Feedback to the child	Control
e.g.-	5	5	5	5	5
	10	5	5	5	1
	15	5	5	2	
Total:		15	15	12	6

NAME:	Teacher Play Period Rating (TPPR)
DEVELOPER:	Harold Wilensky c/o Institute for Developmental Studies School of Education New York University
METHOD:	Observation, teacher-based
SCOPE:	Teacher behavior
DATA FORMAT:	Codes
PERSONNEL:	Non-program

The Teacher Play Period Rating (TPPR) was designed to document teacher activity during indoor play periods since this is the period of time often described by nursery school teachers as their best opportunity for tutorial teaching.

In this procedure, teachers are observed for five minute periods during which recording is made at fifteen second intervals of the nature of their activity. Within the five minute observation, at least 20 discrete categorizations are recorded; in some cases double categorization was necessary to accurately record teacher activity. The observer notes whether the teacher is engaged in interaction with a child and, if so, whether the activity is teacher or child initiated. The activity is then categorized as (a) informal teaching, (b) auxiliary help, (c) controlling behavior, (d) directing child into activity, (e) social contact, (f) role-playing, or (g) inaudible or non-classifiable activity. If the teacher is not engaged in interaction with a child his behavior is classified as (a) teacher-assistant teacher interaction, (b) teacher-other adult interaction, (c) teacher engaged in other activities, (d) teacher observing.

The procedures were utilized by Wilensky to compare teachers and assistant teachers in five different programs which were considered to be similar in philosophy, content, etc. since all were I.D.S. classes. The data collected over a half-year's time (approximately 20% of school days) indicated that teachers did spend a major portion of play periods engaged in activity with children. Significant differences among schools and teachers were found, however, in regard to total amount of interaction. It was also evident that a relatively small proportion of teachers' total interaction with children was devoted to informal teaching.

Reliability was determined by Cohen's coefficient of agreement for nominal scales yielding a "kappa" of .74 which Wilensky cites as directly interpretable as the proportion of joint judgments in which there is agreement after chance agreement is excluded. The standard error of "kappa" was .03 for this sample indicating adequate interrater reliability.

REFERENCES:

Institute for Developmental Studies. Interim Progress Report Part II. Research and Evaluation. Unpublished document, IDS, New York University, 1966.

Wilensky, H. Observational Techniques in Preschool Classrooms. Unpublished document, Institute for Developmental Studies. New York University, 1966.

Institute for Developmental Studies
School of Education
New York University

TEACHER PLAY PERIOD RATING (TPPR)

Teacher________________ Ass't Teacher________________

Observer________________ School__________ Class________

No. of Children__________ Date____________ Time__________

Code: Child-teacher interaction (number begin)
1 - Informal Teaching; 2 - Auxiliary help; 3 - Control; 4 - Directs; 5 - Social or Role play; 6 - Inaudible or Unclassifiable.

Other: (letter begin)
T - teacher-ass't teacher interaction; A - Teacher-other adult; E - Engages in activity;) - Observes; U - Unratable

---

	T Time	AT 9:48	T Time	AT 10:01	T Time	AT 10:10
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						
17.						
18.						
19.						
20.						